

The Nature and the Image of Princely Power in Kievan Rus', 980–1054

A Study of Sources



Walter K. Hanak

АЪТОНІСЬ

ПО ЛАВРЕНТЬЕВСКОМУ СПИСКУ.

2. 1 об. || Се повѣсти времаныгъ¹ лѣтѣ. Окуду есть пошла руская земля². кто къ киевѣ нача перѣѣ³ княжи⁴ и Окуду руская земля стала есть⁴: чѣ-

Се начнемъ повѣсть сию.

По потопѣ. первше⁵ све⁶ Ноеви. раздѣлиша землю. Сивъ. Хамъ. Афет⁷. и нса вѣстокъ. Си-мови Персиа. Ватрѣ⁸. тоже⁹ и до Индикы в до-логу и в ширину [и до Нирокоурва]¹⁰ такоже реци ѿ вѣстока и⁷ до полумены. и Сурия. и Индл¹¹ по Сфратъ рѣку¹². Вавилонъ¹³. Кордуна. Асурани. Мисопотамра¹⁴. Аравия. старѣйшая. Египетъ¹⁵. Инди. Равна. на вса¹⁶.

Хамови же нса. полуменыа страна¹⁴. Египетъ¹⁵. Фовнопъ¹⁶. прилежащы ко Индомъ. друган же

Фовнопъ. из немже исходить рѣка Фовнош-ская. Чермна текущи. на вѣстокъ. Афшани-кли¹⁷ прилежащи. до Куринша¹⁸. Магъмары¹⁹. Асиритисноу²⁰. и друган²¹. Нумиды. Масурии. Мавританы. протиоуци²² Гадирѣ²³. сущимъ же ко востокомъ имать Киликию. Памъфалию. Пи-сидию Мосию²⁴. Лукъцию. Фругию. Камадию²⁵. Ликию Карию. Лудью²⁶. Мисю. другую²⁷ Троя-ду. Салду²⁷. Вифунию. Старую Фругию. и островъ²⁸ неки²⁹ имать. Саръдани³⁰ || Критъ. 2. 2. Кушуръ. и рѣку Гѣилу³¹ зовемую [Нилъ]¹.

The Nature and the Image of
Princely Power in Kievan Rus',
980–1054

East Central and Eastern
Europe in the Middle Ages,
450–1450

General Editor
Florin Curta

VOLUME 25

The Nature and the Image of
Princely Power in Kievan Rus',
980–1054

A Study of Sources

By

Walter K. Hanak



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2014

Cover illustration: Columns 1 and 2 of the *Повѣсть временныхъ лѣтъ* (PVL / transl. *Tale of Bygone Years*), in *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Летописей* (PSRL), Volume 1, 2nd ed. Leningrad 1926.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hanak, Walter K., 1929-

The nature and the image of princely power in Kievan Rus', 980-1054 : a study of sources / by Walter K. Hanak.

pages cm. – (East Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 450-1450, ISSN 1872-8103 ; volume 25)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-25982-9 (hardback : acid-free paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-26022-1 (e-book)

1. Kievan Rus–History–862-1237. 2. Princes–Kievan Rus. 3. Kievan Rus–Kings and rulers. 4. Kievan Rus–History–862-1237–Sources. I. Title.

DK73.H36 2013

947'.02–dc23

2013032777

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1872-8103

ISBN 978-90-04-25982-9 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-26022-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

*This book is dedicated to my beloved wife,
the late Dorothy Abigail Donnelly Hanak*

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	IX
Preface	XI
Acknowledgments	XV
Maps	XVII
1 The Nature and the Early Rus' Image of Kievan Princely Power	1
2 Byzantine Imperial Thought in Theory and Practice in Vladimirian-Jaroslavian Rus'	71
3 The Decline of the Varangians	107
4 The Khazars in the Shadows of Kievan Political Thought	135
5 The Eastern Slavic Political and Social Structure	149
6 Some Conclusions	167
Bibliography	171
Index	191

ABBREVIATIONS

ABAW	Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
AJ	Acta Jutlandica
APH	<i>Acta Poloniae Historica</i>
ASEPL	<i>The American Slavic and East European Review</i> , now titled <i>The Slavic Review</i>
BGA	Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum
БЛДР	<i>Библиотека литературы древней Руси</i> 1, eds. D.S. Likhachev, et. al.
B-NJ	<i>Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher</i>
Bs	<i>Byzantinoslavica</i>
Byz	<i>Byzantion</i>
BZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CFHB	Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae
CHR	<i>The Cambridge History of Russia</i>
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
DOP	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
DOS	Dumbarton Oaks Studies
DOT	Dumbarton Oaks Texts
EC	<i>Ежемесячные сочинения к пользе и увеселению служащие</i>
EO	<i>Echos d'Orient</i>
HS	Historische Studien
HSNPL	<i>Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature</i>
HUS	<i>Harvard Ukrainian Studies</i>
HZ	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
И-М	<i>Историк-Марксист</i>
ИАИЕКУ	<i>Известия общества археологии, истории и этнографии при Казанском университете</i>
ИОРИАС	<i>Известия Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук</i>
ИЗ	<i>Исторические записки</i>
ИЖ	<i>Исторический Журнал</i>
ИзвТОИАЕ	<i>Известия Таврического Общества Истории, Археологии и Етнографии</i>
JGO	<i>Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas</i>
JQR	<i>The Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
ЛЗАК	<i>Летопись Занятия Археографической Комиссии</i>
MGH	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
MHB	<i>Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica</i>
MPH	<i>Monumenta Poloniae Historica</i>
MS	<i>Medieval Studies</i>
OC	<i>Orientalia Christiana</i>
OCA	<i>Orientalia Christiana Analecta</i>

ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , ed. A. Kazhdan, et al.
ОИ	<i>Отечественная История</i>
OSP	<i>Oxford Slavonic Papers</i>
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> . Series graeco-latina
Пи	<i>Проблемы источниковедения</i>
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> . Series Latina
Прилози	<i>Прилози на књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор</i>
ПСП	<i>Проблемы социалистического права</i>
ПСРЛ	<i>Полное собрание русских летописей</i>
ПВЛ	<i>Повѣсть Временнихъ Лѣтъ</i>
RČAV	<i>Rozprawy České Akademie Věd a Umění</i>
REB	<i>Revue des études byzantines</i>
RES	<i>Revue des études slaves</i>
РИБ	<i>Русская историческая библиотека</i>
RPCLT	<i>The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text</i> , eds. S.H. Cross and O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor
S	<i>Slavia</i>
SA	<i>Südosteuropäische Arbeiten</i>
SB	<i>Subsidia Byzantina</i>
SBN	<i>Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici</i>
SEER	<i>The Slavonic and East European Review</i>
SF	<i>Slavistische Forschungen</i>
СГ	<i>Советская Государство</i>
SK	<i>Seminarium Kondakovianum</i>
СКА	<i>Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, Glasnik</i>
СОРЯС	<i>Сборник Отделения Русского Языка и Словесности Императорской Академии Наук</i>
Sp	<i>Speculum</i>
S-S	<i>Scando-Slavica</i>
ТҚДА	<i>Труды Киевской Духовной Академии</i>
ТМП	<i>Труды Музея палеографии</i>
ТОДрЛ	<i>Труды Отдела Древнерусской Литературы</i>
УЗЛУ	<i>Ученые Записки Ленинградского Государственного Университета</i>
ВДИ	<i>Вестник Древней Истории</i>
ВИ	<i>Вопросы истории</i>
ВВ	<i>Византийский временник</i>
ЗИАН	<i>Записки Императорской Академии Наук</i>
ЗИ-ФИСПУ	<i>Записки Историко-Филологического Факультета Императорского С.-Петербургского Университета</i>
ЗНТШ	<i>Записки Наукового Товариства им. Шевченка</i>

PREFACE

The lands, which beginning with the ninth century constituted the principality of Kievan Rus', comprise a vast area of Eastern Europe, the boundaries of which were both indeterminate and continually changing. As a consequence, the lands were exposed to a variety of political, religious, economic, and cultural influences, for they were the crossroads of a number of nations and tribes, each leaving identifying features upon its Slavic population, some enduring and some short-lived. Scandinavians, Khazars, Germans, Poles, Greeks, Pechenegs, Bulgars, among others, transited this vast area, and their visitations and even conquests did not go unnoticed by authors of Eastern Slavic and foreign written sources. However, the legacy of these numerous civilizations is not readily apparent, and too often the Slavic elements predominated to emerge as enduring features, whereas many of the foreign influences petered out, together with the polities from which they had emerged. Then too, their own societies were subject to the constraints of the times and their politics, religion, cultures, and other aspects were undergoing alteration. The maturation of Kievan Rus' was a complex development, and the issues that emerged between 980 and 1054 require an advanced approach in order to address the high degree of complexity in the absence of sufficient sources. Given the nature of the sources and the interpretative evidence at hand, it was, therefore, difficult to draw firm conclusions from this study. The role of the Byzantines, the Varangians, the Khazars, and the native Eastern Slavs is discussed in the following chapters in relation to the nature and the image of princely power in Kievan Rus'.

However, a greater emphasis is placed on the conversion to Eastern Christianity under Prince Vladimir I Svjatoslavich, which opened a seminal period for his disjointed state. The process of adopting and fostering a new religious movement with its political, theological, social, and cultural implications was not without its drawbacks or resistance. The historiography for this period as reflected in the annalistic and literary sources acknowledges the difficulties of making a transition from a predominantly pagan conglomerate of tribal and regional entities, often subdued during periods of tribute collection, warfare, and other general conflicts, to a more formalized and centralized princely realm.

Kievan Rus', a nascent state requiring substantive princely efforts to maintain, was, however, subject to internal political dynamics, varied religious

creeds, and diversified cultural, economic, and tribal forces that could not be dismissed or controlled without difficulty. No princely pronouncements or actions could secure the rapid transition to a new advanced mode of governance and society, based upon Christian tenets. Thus in particular Vladimir and Jaroslav were confronted with disparate elements within their homeland whose influences helped to define the nature and the image of their princely powers. External pressures as well affected the evolution of a nascent Christianized state.

Over several decades, an interest in the annalistic and historical problems of Byzantine and Kievan Rus' history led me to the study of primary sources pertaining to Kievan Rus', from the inception of Vladimir's reign ca. 980 to the death of Jaroslav the Wise in 1054. I noticed a significant gap in historical scholarship of any real discussion of the differing elements contained in the descriptions of princely power in the early annalistic, literary, and other works. While these sources offer rich, even if conflicting and contradictory, materials on the nature of princely authority, the image or literary representations of these leading figures are occasionally obscured by a modified reflection of the prince's political, religious, and other powers. These incongruities cannot be explained as purely national, regional, or native Rus' processes and historical developments. Rather, the primary sources appear to record an interaction between the reality and the notions concerning princely power, and how this power generates an image of itself and thus seeks to justify and preserve itself. Moreover, the textual incongruities appear to be a reflection of a number of currents—Byzantine, Varangian (that is, Scandinavian in a broad context), Khazar, and Eastern Slavic—which influenced in various ways the outlook of Kievan Rus', and played an important role in the historical evolution of princely authority during the formative state process. The following chapters are designed to address each of these currents as key factors enhancing or diminishing Kievan rulership.

The purpose of this work, then, is to interpret what the sources tell or do not tell us about the nature and image of princely power. I will make no attempt to stress the unsaid and will avoid any interpretations based on "the silence of the sources." The main sources are what they are. And furthermore, they are not free of biases, whether regional, provincial or tribal, or of misinterpretations of events and developments. The personages and events that the annals and literary works record are historical and literary in content, although we should admit that historical embellishments are evident, leading to alternate and often difficult interpretations. In addition, local usage determined how scribes and annalists related the achievements and failures of leading figures, and how they viewed events and outcomes.

Thus the annals, literary, and other contemporaneous works describe and portray an image of princely power that occasionally stands at odds with modern historical conclusions. It is the recognition of this incongruity that motivated the writing of this complex study.

Further, this work concentrates in the main upon *The Tale of Bygone Years*, *Повѣсть Временныхъ Лѣтъ*, also commonly rendered as *The Russian Primary Chronicle*. This annal appears in two principal renditions, the *Laurentian* and the *Hypatian*. To these renditions for comparative and interpretative purposes, I have contrasted them with other annals that compilers in later centuries emended and preserved in various redactions, at times modifying the original texts either to lengthen or to shorten the narrative, adding information or reinterpreting specific passages and casting them in a different light. Elsewhere, they simply present us with *lacunae* that are not easily explained, whether due to lost or misplaced folia that were unavailable to the annalists or the desire of the copyists not to replicate particular sections. As a historiographic study of an important phase in the formation of a Christianized Kievan Rus', this work is intended then to refocus upon what the original sources do or do not tell us about the nature and the image of princely power, but as well address the secondary literature (recognizing that there exists a vast secondary literature and discretion had to be exercised in its use and interpretation) that provides further insights into this complex period and into the nature and the image of rulership.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the course of a number of years, I became indebted to a number of individuals who had in one fashion or another advised me on content or on an approach to addressing this study. First, my late wife Dorothy demonstrated patience during my compilation of materials and the actual writing of this work. Given her intellectual skills, she proved to be a valuable asset in seeing this study to fruition. I must also recognize that my children demonstrated patience with their father who was not always available to satisfy their needs. Second, a number of colleagues provided advice and encouragement in various ways. Most recently, I must mention Marios Philippides of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, with whom I have co-authored other monographs, several in print and several forthcoming, who encouraged me to publish this work, and in the meantime made valuable suggestions regarding methodology. As well, I am grateful to Florin Curta of the University of Florida who provided valuable editorial skills and made useful recommendations for textual improvement. And over the years, at scholarly gatherings, I had the good fortune to discuss various aspects in this study with a number of experts in the field. Among them I should especially cite the late Gennady G. Litavrin of the Russian (formerly the Soviet) Academy of Sciences, Moscow; George Majeska of the University of Maryland, College Park, who provided valuable guidance on organization of chapters; Bariša Krekić of the University of California, Los Angeles, who supervised my doctoral dissertation; Jonathan Shepard of Cambridge University; and Christian Raffensperger of Wittenberg University. Lastly, though he was not in my field of study, the late Leo Solt, then chairman of the History Department at Indiana University, Bloomington, undertook numerous measures in countless ways to make sure that I completed my graduate studies with the untimely passing of my mentor, George Soulis. I am most beholden to Professor Solt. If I have overlooked anyone, I apologize for my shortsightedness.

I am especially grateful to Ian Mladjov who prepared the maps for this study. In doing so, he brought to my attention a number of questions, and in response to them I improved a number of passages in this study.

Materials for this study were obtained from a number of university libraries; among them I should especially note Indiana University at Bloomington, the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, Shepherd University, and Dumbarton Oaks. I am most grateful to their staffs for their assistance in obtaining a variety of research tools.

MAPS



KIEVAN RUS', 10th-11th Centuries



CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE AND THE EARLY RUS' IMAGE OF KIEVAN PRINCELY POWER

The annalists and compilers of early Rus' history and writers of hagiographical and literary works acknowledged the achievements of Vladimir I (ca. 980–1015) and his son Jaroslav the Wise (1019–1054), although these same sources recall laconically the actual accomplishments of these princes (sg. *КНАЗЪ*, *КНИЗЪ*, pl. *КНАЗИ*, *КНИЗИ*).¹ Whether we can explain these terse statements in historic or literary terms remains to be addressed. Or whether these elaborations on princely achievements and failures reflect the formative nature of the newly Christianized state and behooves us to recognize the early stage of annalistic and literary accomplishments that were emended in subsequent redactions of the succeeding centuries. On the other hand, the princely sovereignties of Svjatopolk (1015–1019) and thereafter of Mstislav (1019–1036), the latter sharing a divided realm with his brother Jaroslav, are described without the annalists and writers' willingness to admit fully the unfolding historical processes or significance. The rise to power of these four princes coincides with the ushering in of a new era in Kievan history—the introduction of Christianity and the implementation of its teachings—but

¹ I have at this initial stage and will hereafter in this study hesitate to employ the phrase “grand prince (*ВЕЛИКИИ КНАЗЪ/КНИЗЪ*)” for the obvious reason that its introduction into the annalistic and literary tradition is rather late and its usage to 1054 remains a controversial and unresolved point. There exist insufficient contemporaneous sources to clarify clearly this question of usage. Among later Muscovite sources, *К, ПСРЛ* 21/1: 60, and *passim*, identifies Olga as a “grand princess,” and Vladimir as a “grand prince.” Cf. *infra*, n. 5. The term “grand prince” is also ascribed to Jaroslav upon his death in 1054. Cf. *infra*, n. 177. Modern scholars, however, are not in agreement exactly when Rus' writers first employed the title with specific reference to the prince of Kiev, granting to him a superior status and paramount authority over all other princes. Less certain is its usage by contemporaneous foreign writers. Where the phrase appears in Rus' texts prior to 1054, its language use is often unclear and could mean nothing more than “great” or “outstanding” in individual accomplishments, since it is applied equally to lesser princes and even nobles who distinguished themselves in particular undertakings. For a substantive discussion of this issue, cf. A. Poppe, “Words that Serve the Authority: On the Title of ‘Grand Prince’ in Kievan Rus’,” *APH* 60 (1989): 159–184, with substantial bibliography in the footnotes; the article was reprinted in *idem*, *Christian Russia in the Making*, Variorum Collected Studies Series 867 (Aldershot, 2007), essay IX, with two addenda, pp. 185a–191a.

this period also brings to scholarly attention the difficult questions of defining rulership in its political and other contexts within this new framework. For the compilers and writers of the age the basic problem was how to express the actual distinguishing qualities of princely power,² but preserving for posterity a praiseworthy image of princely rulership. Their task was formidable. They were confronted with the issue of age-old regional and tribal influences, as well as foreign influences that could challenge, modify, or even nullify their understanding of Kievan princely power. Thus their works frequently reflect local biases, but at the same time also admit the presence of foreign currents. The annals and literary works as we shall observe portray incomplete and varying images of these princes. Nor do these sources presuppose the orderly establishment of a political hierarchy. Rather, we are confronted with a chaotic period of princely succession and outlooks that required the writers of that age to record, as best as they could, events and accomplishments of their leading princes.

The *Повѣсть вѣременныхъ лѣтъ* (*The Tale of Bygone Years*) or more commonly designated the *Russian Primary Chronicle*³ was one of the first major

² For historiographic studies of this question, cf. S.V. Iushkov, *Общественно-политической строй и право киевского государства. Курс истории государства и права СССР*, 1 (Moscow, 1949): 69–75; and V.P. Shusharin, *Современная буржуазная историография древней Руси* (Moscow, 1964), pp. 156–181.

³ Hereafter cited as *ПВЛ*. I have consistently translated the term *лѣтопись* as “annal,” to distinguish from the term *Хроника*, that is a “chronicle,” although in modern usage the terms are interchangeable and are regarded as being synonymous. Cf. T.V. Gimon and A.A. Ginnius, “Русское летописание в свете типологических параллелей (к постановке проблемы),” in *Жанры и письменной культуре Средневековья* (Moscow, 2005), pp. 174–200, esp. p. 176, where they note that in medieval Rus’ annalistics “annal” was terminologically used rather than “chronicle.” For a discussion of this inconsistency in terminological usage, its derivation from Byzantine, Bulgarian, and Serbian annalistics, and its implications for textual composition, cf. V.N. Demin, *Русь летописная* (Moscow, 2002), pp. 211–213; and the introductory section to W.K. Hanak, “*Vucharest ms. No. 1385 and The Tale of Constantinople, 1453: Some Reconsiderations*,” *Bs* 69 (2011): 267f.

On the authorship of the *ПВЛ*, see especially the introduction to *RPCLT*, pp. 6–12. Though many of the following studies are dated, they merit scholarly attention for their varying interpretations concerning authorship, compilation, and emendation. Also these studies address the contributions of Nestor, Sylvester, and others in the compilation of the *ПВЛ*. Cf. e.g., G.F. Miller, “О первомъ лѣтописателе російскомъ. Преподобномъ Несторе, о его лѣтописи и о продолжателеяхъ,” *ЕС* (April, 1755), pp. 299–324; J.B. Scherer, *Das heiligen Nestors und der Fortsetzer desselben älteste Jahrbücher der Russischen Geschichte vom Jahre 858 bis zum 1203* (Leipzig, 1774), pp. 3–36; A.L. Schlözer, *Nestor. Russische Annale in ihrer slawonischen Grundsprache*, 1 (Göttingen, 1802): 1–119; M. Pogodin, *Несторъ, историческо-критическое разуждение о началъ русскихъ лѣтописей* (Moscow, 1839), pp. 61–112; D.I. Plovaitsky, *Исторія Россіи*, 1 (Moscow, 1876): 176–182; N.K. Nikol’sky, *Матеріалы для повременнаго списка русскихъ писателей и ихъ сочиненіи (X-XI вв.)* (St. Petersburg, 1906), pp. 417–434;

Rus' works to undertake a syncretism of a Kievan historiographic tradition, but favoring the reigns of Vladimir and Jaroslav. Its audience was not intended to be the common populace, few of whom were literate, but rather

S.A. Bugoslavsky, "К вопросу о характере и объеме литературной деятельности преподобного Нестора," *ИОРЯС* 19 (1914), Book 1: 131–186, and Book 3: 153–191; A. Shakhmatov, "Несторъ-лѣтописецъ," *ЗНТШ* 117–118 (1914): 31–53; A.E. Presniakov, "Древнерусское лѣтописание," in *Исторія русской литературы до XIX в.*, ed. A.E. Gruzinsky, 1 (Moscow, 1916): 148–169; M.D. Priselkov, *Нестор-летописец. Опыт историко-литературной характеристики* (Petrograd, 1923); A. Vaillant, "La chronique de Kiev et son auteur," *Prilozi* 20/3–4 (1954): 114–119; and V.N. Tatishchev, *История российской*, 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1962): 119–123. For recent analyses, cf. O. Pritsak, ed., "Introduction," in *idem, The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Četvertyn's'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts 8 (Cambridge, MA, 1990): xv–lxii; I.N. Danilevsky, *Повесть Временных Лет: Герменевтические основы историковедения текстов* (Moscow, 2004), pp. 76–133; and E.G. Vodolazkin, *Всемирная история в литературе Древней Руси (На материале хронографического и палеологического повествования XI–XV веков)*, Sagners Slavistische Sammlung 26 (Munich, 2000; 2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 2008), esp. 41–46, 48–57, and *passim*, who views the *ПВЛ* as both a world and a national history. Also, for this theme, cf. Gimon and Ginnius. For an excellent historiographic treatment of annalistics in the early centuries of Kievan Rus', with a focus upon leading scholarly interpretative approaches over the recent centuries, cf. P.P. Tolochko, *Давньо-руські літописці і літописці X–XIII ст.* (Kiev, 2005), pp. 11–82. Of value also is J. Granberg, *Veche in the Chronicles of Medieval Rus: A Study of Functions and Terminology*, Dissertations from the Department of History, Göteborg University 39 (Göteborg, 2004): 51–64.

The standard impressions of *ПВЛ* are the *Laurentian* redaction (-*L*), *ПСРЛ* 1 (St. Petersburg, 1846); 2nd edition (Leningrad, 1926); and the modern Russian redaction by D.S. Likhachev and B.A. Romanov (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), part 1. Cf. *БЛДР* 1: 62 ff. and 487 ff. The basic English translations are S.H. Cross, "The Russian Primary Chronicle," *HSNPL* 12 (1930): 76–320; and the edition of *RPCLT*. The standard impressions of the *Hypatian* text (-*H*) are *ПСРЛ* 2 (St. Petersburg, 1843); 2nd edition (St. Petersburg, 1908); and the 3rd edition (Petrograd, 1923). Noteworthy is the German rendition of L. Müller, *Die Nestor-chronik: Die alt-russische Chronik, zugeschrieben dem Mönch des Kiever Höhlenkloster Nestor, in der Redaktion des Abtes Sil'vestr aus dem Jahre 1166, rekonstruiert nach den Handschriften Lavrent'evskaja, Radzivilovskaja, Akademičeskaja, Troickaja, Ipat'evskaja und Chlebnikovskaja und ins Deutsche übersetzt* (Munich, 2001). For comparative purposes, cf. the reconstructed text by A.A. Shakhmatov, *Повѣсть временныхъ лѣтъ*, 1 (Petrograd, 1916). All citations hereafter from the *ПВЛ* are extracted from the 2nd editions of the *Laurentian* and *Hypatian* redactions unless otherwise noted. For additional recensions of the *ПВЛ*, cf. S.A. Bugoslavsky, "Повесть временныхъ лет (Списки, редакции, первоначальный текст)," in *Старинная русская повесть. Статьи и исследования*, ed. N.K. Gudzy (Moscow and Leningrad, 1941), pp. 7–37; and R.P. Dmitriev, *Библиография русского летописания* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1962). Their locations in archival depositories are recorded by N.B. Shelamanov, "Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописей XI–XIV вв., хранящихся в СССР," *Археологический ежегодник за 1965 год* (Moscow, 1966), pp. 177–272. Excellent studies on the history and the sources of *ПВЛ* are K.N. Bestuzhev-Riumin, "О составе рысских лѣтописей до конца XIV вѣка," *ЛЗК* 4/1 (1869): 1–157; I.P. Khrushchov, *О древнерусских исторических повѣстьяхъ и сказаніяхъ* (Kiev, 1878); A.A. Shakhmatov, *Разысканія о древнейшихъ русскихъ лѣтописныхъ сводахъ* (St. Petersburg, 1908); V.M. Istrin, "Замечанія о начале русского

the learned Kievan nobility and clergy. The annal from the outset preserves knowledge of the pagan past, the ancient tribal structures, and the glories of a newly Christianized state and the benefits not introduced.

Although not exclusively an original source but rather a compilation of earlier materials, the *ПВЛ* is probably of all extant annalistic sources one of the most contemporaneous in age with the events of 980–1054. Two major redactions of this work, the *Laurentian Annal* (*Лаврентьевская Лѣтопись*), and the *Hypatian Annal* (*Ипатьевская Лѣтопись*),⁴ a mid-fifteenth-century monasterial compilation, furnish descriptive accounts of the nature and the image of Kievan princely power. The age of the two redactions should

легописания. По поводу исследования А. А. Шахматова в области древнерусской летописи," *ИОРЯС* 26 (1923): 45–102, and 27 (1924): 207–251; N.K. Nikol'sky, *Повесть временных лет как источник для истории начального русской письменности и культуры. К вопросу о древнейшем русском летописании*, 1 (Leningrad, 1930); *Древнерусские летописи. Перевод и комментарии*, eds. and trans. V. Lebedev and V. Panov (Moscow and Leningrad, 1936), pp. 315–387; M.D. Priselkov, "Лаврентьевская летопись (история текста)," *УЗЛУГ* 32, серия исторических наук 2 (1939): 76–142; *idem*, *История русского летописания XI–XV вв.* (Leningrad, 1940), pp. 16–44; A.A. Shakhmatov, "Повесть временных лет и ее источники," *ТОДРЛ* 4 (1940): 9–150; N.L. Rubinshtein, *Русская историография* ([Moscow], 1941), pp. 20–26; J. Macūrek, *Dějepisectví evropského východu* (Prague, 1946), pp. 163–169; D.S. Likhachev, *Русские летописи и их культурно-историческое значение* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1947); L.V. Cherepnin, *Русская историография до XIX века* (Moscow, 1957), pp. 26–62; I.L. Sherman, *Русские исторические источники X–XVIII вв.* (Kharkov, 1959), pp. 27–41; M.N. Tikhomirov, *Источниковедение истории СССР*, 1 (Moscow, 1962), pp. 54–68; and A.G. Kuz'min, *Начальные этапы древнерусского летописания* (Moscow, 1977), *passim*. Also, cf. N.F. Kotlar, *Древняя Русь и Киев в летописных преданиях и легендах* (Kiev, 1986).

Of recent interest is the very title *Повѣсть врѣменныхъ лѣтъ*. For a critical analysis of the title, cf. H.G. Lunt, "Повѣсть врѣменныхъ лѣтъ? or Повѣсть врѣменъ и лѣтъ?," *Palaeoslavica* 5 (1997): 317–326.

⁴ D.G. Ostrowski, comp. and ed., with D.J. Birnbaum and H.G. Lunt, *The Pověst' vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature 10/1 (Cambridge, MA, [2003]): xviii, wherein Ostrowski states: "Despite the importance of the PVL [*sic*] as a historical source, the published versions of the *ПВЛ* that have appeared thus far either have not been based on clear and consistent principles of editing or have not always relied on sufficient textual evidence. The current edition has attempted to remedy these failings by: (1) setting forth at the beginning the principles of textual criticism according to which variants were evaluated; (2) using a stemma to help in evaluating difficult variants; (3) consulting all the chronicles and manuscript copies that testify to readings in the *ПВЛ*; (4) ...; (5) reducing normalizations to a minimum so as to more accurately represent the orthography of the manuscripts." Their interlinear collation focuses on five manuscripts, three renditions of the *ПВЛ* that are published, cf. p. xix, n. 4, and the *Novgorod* 1 and *Trinity Annals*. I have preferred, recognizing their shortcomings, to use the published versions that appear in the *ПСРЛ* series, as well as separate editions, and address the variant texts as appropriate, a number of which do not appear nor are cited in Ostrowski's work.

raise suspicions whether or not a Muscovite ideology with its focus upon a centralized state concept crept into the texts, but we should accept that the scribal monks attempted to preserve the original written materials, although we notice orthographical and grammatical digressions, some deletions and additions, and even some substituted word choices that do not substantially alter the essential historical information, yet some alterations are to be noted that do alter the sense of particular passages. The *ПВА*, however, became the archetype for later annals⁵ and each of these works,

⁵ Of the later chronicles, the more important is the *Новгородская летопись*, *ПСРЛ* 3 (St. Petersburg, 1841), and 4 (St. Petersburg, 1848). These volumes contain the four primary redactions of the *Novgorod Annal*, the earliest of which is attributed to a sixteenth-century compilation. We should also scrutinize the facsimile edition of a Novgorod annalistic manuscript, *Новгородская харатейная летопись*, ed. M.N. Tikhomirov (Moscow, 1964). The *Псковская летопись*, perhaps a fifteenth-century work, appears in several textual editions included in volumes 4 and 5 of the *ПСРЛ* (St. Petersburg, 1851); with *П₁* in *Псковские летописи*, ed. A.N. Nasonov, 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941): 8–9, that is the first redaction of this annal, excises all references to the princes after Olga, but briefly records Vladimir's rule beginning with 988 and the events leading to his baptism. Vol. 2: 10–12 and 75, of the Nasonov edition (Moscow, 1955), contains *П₂* and has significance for this study, whereas *П₃* in three cited redactions, the first of which is a fragment, is of little value for this investigation. *П₂* devotes only brief notice of Jaroslav's rise to power and his death. The initial rendition of the *Софийская летопись*, a fifteenth-century work, and as well several later redactions, appear in *ПСРЛ* 5 and 6 (St. Petersburg, 1853). The *Троицкая летопись*, an early fifteenth-century work though appearing here as a reconstructed work, was published by M.D. Priselkov, *Троицкая Летопись. Реконструкция текста* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), and merits notice. For some of the issues relative to the Priselkov reconstruction, cf. C.J. Halperin, "Text and Textology: Salmina's Dating of the Chronicle Tales about Dmitrii Donskoi," *SEER* 79 (2001): 251–252. The *Летопись по Воскресенскому списку*, *ПСРЛ* 7 (St. Petersburg, 1857); and the sixteenth-century *Патриаршая или Никоновская летопись*, *ПСРЛ* 9 and 10 (St. Petersburg, 1862 and 1865), preserve the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian historiographic tradition. The *Nikonian Annal* has been translated into a multi-volume English edition by S.A. and Betty J. Zenkovsky, of which vol. 1, *The Nikonian Chronicle: From the Beginning to the Year 1132* (Princeton, 1984), is germane to this research. Three sixteenth-century annals: the *Львовская летопись*, *ПСРЛ* 20, parts 1 and 2 (St. Petersburg, 1910–1914; repr. Moscow, 2005); further the *Книга степенная царского родословия*, *ПСРЛ* 21, parts 1 and 2 (St. Petersburg, 1908–1913); and the *Хронографъ редакции 1512 года*, *ПСРЛ* 22, part 1 (St. Petersburg, 1911; repr. Moscow, 2005), are valuable sources for their faithful documentation of personages and events, albeit with some obvious emendations and deletions of essential information for the early Kievan period. Cf. the redaction of Gail D. Lenhoff and N.N. Pokrovsky, *Степенная книга царского родословия по древнейшим спискам*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 2007–2012). The *Могиловская летописный сводъ XV вѣка*, *ПСРЛ* 25 (Moscow, 1949); the *Никоновская летопись*, *ПСРЛ* 27 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1962); and also the *Владимирский летописецъ*, *ПСРЛ* 30 (Moscow, 1963), remain useful works. Lastly, we should cite the seventeenth-century chronograph, *Тверская летопись*, *ПСРЛ* 15 (St. Petersburg, 1863). The acronyms for the works are hereafter cited respectively as:

regardless of their thematic and chronological contents as well as geographical origins, whether of northern or southern, or eastern or western, provenance and hence replete with regional biases, presents a generally homogeneous account of Vladimir's and Jaroslav's reigns. Concerning Svjatopolk and Mstislav, caution should be exercised in making a similar characterization.

About 1075, the Kievan monk, Jakob, recorded in his *Память и похвала равноапостольному князю Владимиру* (A Eulogy and Praise of the Apostle-like Prince Vladimir),⁶ that on 11 June 978 (6486), this prince assumed the

<i>В</i>	<i>ЛѢТОПИСЬ ПО ВОСКРЕСЕНСКОМУ СПИСКУ</i>
<i>ВЛ</i>	<i>ВЛАДИМИРСКИЙ ЛѢТОПИСЕЦЪ</i>
<i>К</i>	<i>КНИГА СТЕПЕННАЯ ЦАРСКОГО РОДОСЛОВИЯ</i>
<i>Л</i>	<i>ЛЬВОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>ЛЛ</i>	<i>МОСКОВСКИЙ ЛѢТОПИСНЫЙ СВОДЪ XV ВѢКА</i>
<i>Ннк</i>	<i>НИКОНОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>НК</i>	<i>НОГОРОДСКАЯ КАРАМЗИНСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>Н</i>	<i>НОГОРОДСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>П</i>	<i>ПСКОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>ПВЛ</i>	<i>ПОВЕСТЬ ВРЕМЕННЫХЪ ЛѢТЪ</i>
<i>ПН</i>	<i>ПАТРИАРХАЛА ИЛИ НИКОНОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>С</i>	<i>СОФІЙСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>Т</i>	<i>ТВЕРСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>Тр</i>	<i>ТРОИЦКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ</i>
<i>Х</i>	<i>ХРОНОГРАФЪ РЕДАКЦИИ 1512 ГОДА</i>

For the origins and textual significance of each of the redactions of these annals/chronographs, cf. the prefatory discussions in the *ПСРЛ* series and for the *Novgorod Annal* A.A. Shakhmatov, *Обозрение русских летописных сводов XIV-XVI вв.* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1938), pp. 182–188; and Likhachev, *Русские летописи, passim*. The *Pskov Annal* is studied by Likhachev, *ibid.*, pp. 472–474; and the *Nikon Annal*, a source that may contain information from earlier annals no longer extant or were unavailable to the compilers of the *Laurentian* and *Hyratian* redactions of the *ПВЛ*, is further analyzed by Shakhmatov, *Разысканія*, pp. 243–245; and Likhachev, *Русские Летописи*, pp. 475–479. The *L'von Annal* is studied by Shakhmatov, *Разысканія*, pp. 236–237; and Likhachev, *Русские Летописи*, pp. 474–475; while the *Book of Ranks* and the *Chronograph Redaction* are evaluated by Likhachev, *ibid.*, *passim* (cf. pp. 32 ff. in particular for the *Chronograph Redaction*). The remaining annals have not received similar comment or study by scholars. For a synthesis of the annalistic tradition most recently, cf. G.T. Chupin, *Предистория и история Киевской Руси, Украины и Крыма* (Kharkov, 2010), pp. 16–33.

⁶ Makarii, Metropolitan of Moscow, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1 (2nd ed., rev., St. Petersburg, 1968): esp. 255–260. This is a sixteenth-century variant text. Cf. *Мусин-Пушкинский Сборникъ 1414 года ...*, ed. V.I. Sreznevsky (St. Petersburg, 1893), pp. 17 ff.; *Памятники древнерусской церковно-учительной литературы*, ed. A.T. Ponomarev, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1894): 69–76; V.I. Sreznevsky, “Память и похвала кн. Владимиру и его житие, по списку 1494 г.,” *ЗИАН*, series 8, 1 (1897): 2–4; E.E. Golubinsky, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1 (2nd ed., Moscow, 1901): 245; and *Сборникъ въ память святаго равно-апостольнаго князие Владимира*

rule of the Kievan state, although most Rus' annals fix the start of his reign about 980.⁷ Before we examine his rise to power, two issues should be addressed that are invoked by this title. First, Vladimir, who is given recognition for the formal establishment of Christianity in his state, is awarded the qualifier of *apostle-like*⁸ for his notable achievement. It is clear that at an early stage in annalistic compilation and literary works the religious scribes sought to revere his image and awarded him this esteemed eminence. Whether fully deserving or less so, Vladimir in a matter of six decades after his death was honored with a great compliment. Second, it is noteworthy that he was not recognized as a grand prince, and this may be indicative that in this the eleventh century the title was sparingly used and not in the context that later annalists would accept or utilize.

From the onset of Rus' annalistic writing, it was essential for the scribes, having been schooled in the Byzantine historiographic tradition, although there is internal evidence in the Rus' sources that they were aware of some traditions found in especially Germanic and Scandinavian annals, to recall the early decades of Kievan Rus' much as the Old Testament books developed their pre-David/Solomon accounts. The Hebrew tribal structure, not fully elaborated because the Old Testament histories are essentially a history of one tenth of one tribe, the tribe of Joseph and very little is commented upon of the other eleven, provided for the Rus' scribes few suitable parallels that could be employed as a model for their own structure. The Rus' annalists may have been aware of the Old Testament tribal tradition, but could

(Petrograd, 1917). Further, Nikol'sky, *Материалы*, pp. 225–230; and Shakhmatov, *Разыскания*, pp. 13–28. Most recently, *БЛДР* 1: 316–327 and 524–527.

Jan Długosz, *Annales seu cronicae incliti regni poloniae* (Warsaw, 1964), pp. 191–192, records that Vladimir deposed Jaropolk in 976 and two years later he undertook construction in Kiev of pagan temples for the Varangian-Slavic deities. His chronology is a few years early, but the dating is not unlike that of Jakob's. Cf. M.N. Tikhomirov, *Исторические связи России со славянскими странами и Византией* (Moscow, 1969), p. 230.

⁷ A.V. Nazarenko, *Древняя Русь на международных путях. Междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX–XII веков* (Moscow, 2001), p. 376, addresses the issue of the year that Vladimir gained the Kievan seat, offering three plausible sets of years: 978 (6486), 979 (6487), and 980–981 (6488), based on annalistic evidence. He further, *ibid.*, pp. 376–379, judiciously examines the question of the length of Jaropolk's rule at Kiev, generally accepted to be eight years, but the inception of his rule is either 970 or 972, thus placing the rise of Vladimir to the Kievan seat either in 978, late 980, or early 981. However, Nazarenko, p. 442, then fixes the inclusive dates of Jaropolk's rule as 972–978, which then poses the question of who ruled in Kiev between 969–972, during the absence of Svjatoslav from the town, which neither he nor the sources substantially clarify.

⁸ Makarii, *История русской церкви*, 1: 255 ff., consistently confers upon Vladimir the designation of "apostle."

only apply its historical books with difficulty, being aware that their own semi-legendary tradition differed substantively from that of the Old Testament accounts.⁹ And especially, no one Rus' tribe could be credited with the foundation of the Kievan state. The Rus' annalists were also learned in the Byzantine textual construction and could have emulated the latter, composing their accounts similar to the Greek. To what degree this was possible is problematic, because the Byzantine scribes also modeled their works after the Old Testament tribal tradition, but as well drew substantially upon their rich classical heritage, something we find lacking in the Rus' traditional legacy. If anything, the Rus' scribes chose as their primary model, but with significant emendation, the ninth-century universal chronicle of the Byzantine George the Monk (Georgios Hamartolos),¹⁰ a work that was often copied in part for their early chapters by Slavic scribes.

The question must then be addressed whether Rus' historical evidence supports the earlier date for Vladimir's accession to the Kievan seat and to sole power, which would render valid the assertion of Jakob. Vladimir's victory over his half-brother Jaropolk (969?-978?), albeit a victory that employed considerable guile and subterfuge over a young prince who may have been reared a Christian by his grandmother Olga,¹¹ although this does

⁹ On this historiographic topic, cf. I.N. Danilevsky, "Библия и Повесть Временных Лет (К проблеме интерпретации летописных текстов)," *ОИ* 1 (1993): 78–94, esp. 81 ff.; and *idem*, *Повесть Временных Лет*, esp. pp. 90–110. Further on biblical allegory and annalistic image, cf. G. Maniscalco-Basile, "The Christian Prince through the Mirror of Rus' Chronicles," in *Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine*, eds. O. Pritsak and I. Ševčenko, *HUS* 12/13 (Cambridge, MA, 1988–1989): 672–688.

¹⁰ Cf. the Πίναξ (Table), pp. xxxviii–lii, for a genealogical chronology from Adam to the end of the biblical cycle, in *Χρονικὸν σύντομον ἐκ διαφόρων χρονογράφων τε καὶ ἐξηγητῶν συλλεγὲν καὶ συντεθέν ὑπὸ Γεωργίου Ἀμαρτολοῦ Μοναχοῦ*. *Χρονογραφὸς Γεωργία Ἀμαρτολα*, ed. E. von Muralt (St. Petersburg, 1859); *Georgii Monachi Chronikon*, ed. C. de Boor, 1 (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 6 ff.; *Хроника Георгия Амартола въ древнемъ славяноорекскомъ переводѣ*, ed. V.M. Istrin, 1: *Тексты* (Petrograd, 1920; repr. as *Die Chronik des Georgios Hamartolos*, ed. V.M. Istrin, 1, Slavische Propyläen 135 [Munich, 1972]), pp. 3–26. Noteworthy is that the Greek and Slavonic texts commence with the chronology from Cain and Abel, omitting the Creation cycle and the Adam and Eve account, and enter only brief statements concerning various biblical, Roman, and Byzantine rulers to the ninth century AD, often no more than single sentences of limited value. But interspersed from pp. 27 ff. are substantial texts in the chronographic writing tradition.

¹¹ On this complex issue and the sources addressing the scene in Kievan Rus' on the eve of its acknowledged Christianization under Vladimir, cf. Nazarenko, ch. 7, esp. 379 ff., wherein he analyzes the Latin influence upon and interactions with Kievan Rus' in the decade of Jaropolk. Further, the Rus' annals make no statement that he was a pagan, and also they do not acknowledge him to be a Christian, albeit, a Latin Christian. It is possible, as Nazarenko,

not imply that he was baptized a Christian, or was at least influenced by his rudimentary knowledge of its teachings, represents the culmination of the pagan prince's attempts to bring about the reunification of Kievan Rus' under one head in the late 970s. Vladimir's father, Svjatoslav (959?-972?), who saw no need to maintain a unified state ruled from Kiev, and the Rus' annalists devote much discussion of him and his Varangian influences, precipitated the fratricidal conflicts of that decade. Svjatoslav envisioned the formation of a heterogeneous empire, comprising some territories of Kievan Rus', and of conquered lands of the Khazars, Balkan Bulgars, and perhaps even Byzantine lands and especially the prize of Constantinople, as well as other regions. These lands would mold the nucleus for a larger political entity, dominated by the pagan Varangian-Slavic Rus'¹² and ruled from Perejaslavets¹³ on the Danube. In order to retain his hold on Kiev as a source of revenue derived from its commercial activities and collection of tributes, he established his eldest son Jaropolk as its prince. To maintain control over the divisive Slavic tribal structure, he placed his second son Oleg as prince of the Drevljane, one of the more independent-minded and troublesome East Slavic tribes. Svjatoslav granted to his sons the requisite authority to rule their respective territories.¹⁴ The Novgorodians, upon learning of Svjatoslav's

p. 380, and again on p. 382, suggests that Jaropolk had been about 975 baptized a Christian by German monks. The sources further tell us that Jaropolk's mother was a Hungarian princess, who as well may have been a Christian, although this is not absolutely certain. If she was of the Latin persuasion, she may have influenced Jaropolk to become one too. On this, cf. Chupin, *Предистория и история Киевской Руси*, pp. 275–279. It is understandable that the Rus' annalists would efface this information from their accounts given their predisposition for Orthodoxy, although Olga also had entertained the idea of adopting Latin Christianity. No such deletion of information, however, occurs for her period of rule, for she according to legend was baptized in Constantinople. This complex issue has received insufficient attention in the volumes dedicated to the history of Kievan Rus'.

¹² On the ethnicity of the Varangians and the question of whether they were Slavs, cf. the complex discussion of I.N. Danilevsky, *Древняя Русь глазами современников (IX–XII вв.)* (Moscow, 1999), pp. 46–53.

¹³ On this urban center, cf. N. Oikonomides, "Persthlavitz, the Little Preslav," *Südost-Forschungen* 42 (1983): 1–9; and W.K. Hanak, "The Infamous Svjatoslav: Master of Duplicity in War and Peace?," in *Peace and War: Essays in Honor of George T. Dennis, S.J.*, eds. T.S. Miller and J. Nesbitt (Washington, DC, 1995), esp. 141–145. For source materials, cf. P.P. Tolochko, "Летописные известия о походах Святослава на Дунай и их источники," *ВВ* 66 (91) (2007): 146–154.

¹⁴ A.E. Presniakov, *Княжое право в древней Руси. Очерки по истории X–XII столетий*, ЗИ-ФФИСПУ, part 90 (St. Petersburg, 1909): 27–28. I cannot accept the contention of H. Paszkiewicz, *The Origins of Russia* (London, 1954), p. 152, who reasons that Svjatoslav possessed and ruled over only those lands which he had assigned to his sons Jaropolk and Oleg. The

designs and his abandonment of rule in Kiev, were eager to profit from his political reorganization and to gain greater independence for themselves in the conduct of their affairs. They prevailed upon Svjatoslav to appoint a prince for them, or they threatened to select one for themselves.¹⁵ Desiring to retain at the least a modicum of control over the Novgorodian lands and the northern regions, Svjatoslav heeded their demand and designated the youthful Vladimir to be their prince. The division of the Kievan Rus' state into three separate and distinct units, although there may well have been others that cannot be discerned from the extant sources and that were subservient to the prince at Perejaslavets, momentarily disrupted the political hegemony of the Kievan Rus' state and introduced for the next decade divisiveness among Svjatoslav's progeny and the subject peoples of the three sons.

However, Svjatoslav's dream of constructing a new pagan empire with its capital situated on the Danube was shattered by a series of humiliating military defeats administered by the Byzantines.¹⁶ On his return march to Kiev in 972 (6480) after signing a treaty of no great consequence for the Rus', he was ambushed by the Pechenegs, a nomadic people of Turkic stock, above the cataracts of the Dnieper River where, after a difficult winter stay, he ultimately met his death.¹⁷ His passing ushered in a period of fratricidal strife. Sveinald, the leading commander in charge of Svjatoslav's forces on the Balkan campaign and a major promoter of the pagan ascendancy during

issue is more complex than he admits, although the annals remain silent on many aspects of this question. On these events, cf. *ПСРЛ* 1: 69; and 2: 57. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 87; and *БЛДР* 1: 118–119.

¹⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 69; and 2: 57. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 87; and *БЛДР* 1: 118–119.

¹⁶ Cf. Hanak, "The Infamous Svjatoslav," pp. 145–150. For an annalistic description of the Byzantine-Rus' conflict, cf. Leon Diakonos, *Leonis Diaconi Caloënsis historiae libri decem*, ed. C.B. Hase, CSHB (Bonn, 1828), pp. 63, 77–78, 105, and 156 f.; and Symeon Logothetes, *Annales*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1838), pp. 153–154. Also, V.I. Sreznevsky, *Славянскій переводъ хроники Симеона Логогета* (St. Petersburg, 1909); repr., *Slavjanskij perevod chroniki Simeona Logotheta* (London, 1971), pp. 149 and 151–154; and *Die Chronik des Symeon Metaphrastes und Logothetes*, Slavische Propyläen 99 (Munich, 1971): 149 and 151–154. Paradoxically, no mention of Svjatoslav (СВЯТОСЛАВЪ, Σφενδοσλάβος) and his encounters with the Byzantines appears in the most recent Greek textual reconstruction by S. Wahlgren, ed., *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, CFHB 44/1 (Berlin and New York, 2006), although references in a different context are made to the Rus', 131.29–30 (pp. 245–246), and 136.71–75 (pp. 335–337). For a summation of the sources, cf. Elena A. Mel'nikova, *Древняя Русь в свете зарубежных источников. Учебное пособие* (Moscow, 1999), pp. 122–127.

¹⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 73–74; and 2: 61–62. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 90; and *БЛДР* 1: 122–123, and 501; and M.D. Priselkov, *Очерки по церковно-политической истории Киевской Руси X–XII вв.* (St. Petersburg, 1913), p. 13.

Svjatoslav's rule, was instrumental in prevailing upon Jaropolk to abolish the tripartite division of the Kievan state and to reunite the Kievan lands. The question must then be raised whether Sveinald would have supported a Christian state under Jaropolk's rule, for, as we have previously noted, the young prince had been under the influence of his grandmother Olga, who had accepted a personal Christianization?¹⁸ Or, was Sveinald at the moment

¹⁸ On her personal baptism to Byzantine Christianity, noteworthy is the *Похвала княгини Ольги, како крѣна добръ пожне по заповѣди Гѣ*, in V.I. Sreznevsky, "Память и похвала кн. Владимиру," pp. 4–5. Cf. S.M. Soloviev, *История России с древнейших времен*, 1 (Moscow, 1959): esp. 153–160; and W.K. Hanak, *The Origin of Kievan Rus'*, ch. 3, forthcoming. There exists a substantial literature on Olga and her Christianization, now placed between 1–9 September 957, although a number of modern scholars adhere to the year of 946 for which there exists some significant evidence, while other scholars attribute her baptism to ca. 955, and her legendary visit to Constantinople. Zenkovsky, 1: 55, n. 46, interpreting Constantine Porphyrogenetos's *De Cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, ed. J.J. Reiske, CSHB 1 (Bonn, 1829), maintains that on the occasion of her visit to Constantinople in 957 [*sic*] "she was already baptized and was accompanied by an Orthodox priest." Zenkovsky, however, does not qualify whether she was baptized in the Latin or Byzantine Rite. Gregory, if an Orthodox priest, may have been a low ranking monk, whose main role was to minister to the Greek community in Kiev. The interpretation of Zenkovsky is quite plausible, since in the foreign quarter of Kiev there were resident Greek merchants and others who most probably brought with them their own clergy to tend to their sacral needs. Certainly, these monks were not of high birth, but rather of the lower social classes and were often assigned such distant missions. C. Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World*, Harvard Historical Studies 177 (Cambridge, MA, 2013): 157, believes that Gregory may have been of the Latin rite. This is quite plausible. We have little evidence to substantiate this assertion that there was significant religious Latinization taking place in Kievan Rus'. The more substantive German attempt at this comes a few years later of which we have no Rus' record, demonstrating that it either proved to be a failure or the Kievan Rus' dismissed Germanic attempts at religious proselytization, given its political implications for themselves. Olga's grandsons (excepting Vladimir) most likely were Latin Christians and therefore Raffensperger is correct in his analysis that Gregory was a Latin monk. Further, Olga, familiar with Byzantine duplicity in their prior relations, may have brought along Gregory in her own act of duplicity to put pressure on the Greeks and to gain some concessions. I am inclined to accept the notion, unless new evidence comes to light, that he was of Greek stock, but a lower class monk who did have a priestly office. Given the economic and trading significance of Olga's visit, it is questionable whether she would have had her delegation include a Latin monk, but then given the accounts associated with Olga she was determined to enhance her position vis-à-vis the Greeks. For other editions of *De Cerimoniis*, cf. those of J.P. Migne, *PG* 112 (Paris, 1859); and *Le livre des ceremonies*, ed. A. Vogt, 2 vols. (Paris, 1967). Among the recent important body of secondary literature, cf. A.V. Kartashev, *Очерки по истории русское церкви*, 1 (Paris, 1959): 97–104; G. Podskalsky, *Christentum und Theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237)* (Munich, 1982), pp. 16 ff., 116–121, and 210 ff.; and A. Poppe, "Once again Concerning the Baptism of Olga, Archontissa of Rus'," *DOP* 46 (1992): 271–277; repr. in *idem, Christian Russia in the Making*, essay II, with addendum, pp. 278a–279a, that makes reference to the latest essential studies. Cf. *infra*, n. 54, for this controversial issue. G.T. Chupin, *Русь и религия*

urging Jaropolk to reunify the lands of Kiev,¹⁹ but was involved in subterfuge and had other designs for the state, preserving a pagan-Varangian bastion? These suspicions regarding Sveinald's ultimate plans for Kiev are topics that cannot be easily resolved because of an absence of attention to his motives in the annalistic sources.

Sveinald appears to have instigated the struggle between Jaropolk and Oleg when he dispatched his son, Ljut, on the pretext of participating in a hunting expedition, onto the private game preserve of Oleg. Oleg, also hunting on his lands at that particular moment, came upon Ljut and slew him for the trespassing violation. Sveinald may not have wished the death of his son, but Ljut's death now became a *cause célèbre* in Jaropolk's court and Sveinald reminded the prince that Oleg was responsible for Ljut's killing.²⁰ But at the root of Sveinald's prodding may have even been his personal aspiration to become the real power behind the Kievan seat and perhaps to reunite the Kievan lands under his own disguised leadership. The struggle between Jaropolk and Oleg that had begun in 975 (6483) came to a tragic conclusion two years later when Oleg, in haste to cross a bridge leading to safety behind the walls of the town of Vrychyi, fell to his death into the moat surrounding the fortified town (*рѣдѣхъ*).²¹ Consequently, Jaropolk's first hurdle in bringing about the reunification of the Kievan lands had been removed and there remained only Vladimir who could impede his ambitions. Sensing that Jaropolk would soon attack him, Vladimir fled to Scandinavia where he gathered a Varangian mercenary army. He returned to Novgorod, amassed an additional force of Varangians, Slovenes, Chud', and Krivichi, and set out upon his march to assault Kiev. But Vladimir was not simply content to conquer his half-brother's town. He sought the assistance of Blut, Jaropolk's

(Kharkov, 2011), pp. 42–48, furnishes an ample historiographic analysis of secondary literature concerning her visit to the imperial city. For legends and other accounts regarding her baptism, cf. A.A. Aleksandrov, *Во времена княгини Ольги. Легенды и были о княгине Ольге в Псковской земле* (Pskov, 2001), pp. 142–196.

¹⁹ Given the vagueries of the phrase "Rus' land," I have taken license to use the phrase to identify a geographical area without specific limits centered about Kiev and under its princely rule. Further, for the want of better and more accurate expression, I use throughout this study the term "principality," that signifies the lands under the rule of a Kievan prince. For a good discussion of the issue, cf. C.J. Halperin, "The Concept of the Russian Land from the Ninth to the Fourteenth Centuries." *Russian History/Histoire russe* 2 (1975): esp. 29–30 and accompanying notes.

²⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 74; and 2: 62. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 91; and *БЛДР* 1: 122–123.

²¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 74–75; and 2: 62–63. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 91; and *БЛДР* 1: 122–125.

leading commander who appears to have displaced Sveinald,²² to betray the Kievan prince and to bring about his downfall. Blud was responsive to Vladimir's overture and only the details regarding the manner of Jaropolk's death required attention. The method of his assassination, however, proved troublesome. Eager to have the bloody affair done with, Blud urged Vladimir to storm the town that he entered on 11 June 978 (6486),²³ while Blud at the same time encouraged Jaropolk to abandon Kiev and to take flight to Rodnja at the mouth of the Ros' River. Once Vladimir had accomplished the siege and occupation of Kiev, he was again free to redirect his attention to Jaropolk and to dispose of his fraternal rival. Vladimir set out to storm Rodnja's fortifications. Meanwhile, the deception continued and Blud induced Jaropolk to seek peace in face of overwhelming opposition and to enter into direct negotiations with his half-brother. A meeting was arranged and when Jaropolk entered the chamber of the designated meeting place, Vladimir's Varangian guard set upon Jaropolk with their swords and slew him.²⁴

The compilers of the *ПѢА* furnish a wealth of detail and exceptional clarity in recounting Vladimir's rise to power and his superiority to rule over all of the Kievan lands. His conquest of Kiev had made a deep impression upon them, although his conversion to Christianity nearly a decade later created an obvious tendency by contemporaneous writers to idealize him and to some degree even to recognize approvingly his years of pagan rule, deemed to be sinful, but preparatory for his Christianization. The scribes are intent initially to portray Vladimir like his father to be indeed a true pagan. But, while Svjatopolk met an inglorious end for his misdeeds and miscalculations, Vladimir through baptism, though his early rule emulated that of

²² The sources are silent on his disappearance, and the mystery of his vanishing from sight and of any further mention of him in the historical or literary record remains unresolved. The question must be postulated: Although it is known the Sveinald was a strong proponent of paganism, did he come into religious conflict with Jaropolk who may have favored the advent of Christianity? Clearly, the annalists seem to have little knowledge of this ideological conflict, unless they chose to minimize its significance and the presence of Christian converts among the Varangian-Slavic elite and general populace as the sources attest, and were predisposed to elaborate upon the baptized Olga and Vladimir, to each of whom they are clearly partial. There may have also been other issues between the two men, of which we have no knowledge and the sources do not elaborate upon these questions.

²³ This is the same date that Jakob marks as the beginning of Vladimir's rule. Cf. Golubinsky, 1: 245.

²⁴ *ПСП* 1: 78; and 2: 66. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 93; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–125.

his father, was Christianized and redeemed for his past transgressions. As a result, they note in substantial detail the prince's sinful stage, but stress that he had repented with his religious conversion.

The *ПВЛ* also at first reading conveys the impression that Vladimir's reign began without any major checks upon his authority and that unitary rule existed in Kievan Rus', although after 980 the annalists record his martial actions, his need to put down recalcitrant Slavic and other tribes who had challenged his claim to sole authority. The *ПВЛ-Л* and *ПН* recall: И НАЧА КНАЖИТИ ВОЛОДОМНОРЪ ВЪ КНЕВѢ ЕДИНЬ ..., "and Vladimir began to reign *alone* in Kiev ..."²⁵ Unlike the *Laurentian* redaction, the *Hypatian* further elaborates and reads: Я ЕМО НЕ ПУЦАН НИ ЕДИНЪ И НАЧА КНАЖИТИ ВОЛОДОМНОРЪ ВЪ КНЕВѢ ОДИНЪ, "but here he did not allow to anyone and Vladimir began to rule *alone* in Kiev."²⁶ At first sight the *Laurentian* statement appears accurate, for the annalists saw no need to explain or to enlarge further upon what they had stated. The use of the term "alone" can, however, be understood in other contexts. To address several possibilities, it could imply that he undertook rule exclusive of others, denying to them a share of power, or it could be a claim for the establishment of autocracy from the inception of his rule. But other annals appear to question the claim to solitary rule. *Л*, *НК*, *С*, *Т*, and *В* relate only that Vladimir began his rule in Kiev without qualifying whether he shared power with others (or another) or ruled exclusive of them, sitting as the paramount head.²⁷ *В*, reflecting a strong Muscovite political ideology, ascribes to Vladimir, on the occasion of having slain his half-brother Jaropolk and the occupation of

²⁵ Italics are mine. *ПСРЛ* 1: 79; and *ПН*, *ibid.*, 9: 40; and *Т*, *ibid.*, 15: 73, that read with a slight alteration in wording and word order: НАЧАТЬ КНАЖИТИ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ЕДИНЪ ВЪ КИЕВѢ, "Vladimir began to reign alone in Kiev;" whereas *ВЛ*, *ibid.*, 30:24, simply and redundantly reads: НАЧАЛО КНАЖЕНАВЪ ВЪ КНЕВѢ ВОЛОДИМЕРОВА. НАЧА КНАЖИТИ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ВЪ КНЕВѢ ..., "there began in Kiev the princely rule of Vladimir. Vladimir began [his] princely rule in Kiev ...;" and *Тр*, p. 93. *Пз*, *ibid.*, 5: 2; and Nasonov, 2: 10, assert: ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ЖЕ СЪДЕ НА ВЕЛИКОМЪ КНАЖЕНЬИ ВЪ КИЕВѢ ..., "Vladimir sat upon the grand princely [seat] in Kiev ...;" however, *Пз*, Nasonov, 2: 74; and *Х*, *ПСРЛ* 22/1: 366 (with slight emendation), read: Володомир же сѣде в граде Кieve ..., "Vladimir sat in the town of Kiev ..." Cf. Tatischev, 2 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1963): 56, wherein the *Joachim Chronicle* omits the *Laurentian* phrase and substitutes: Володимир же, государствуя в Кieve ..., "Vladimir, having begun to rule in Kiev ..." Tatischev, *ibid.*, further maintains that upon the slaying of Jaropolk in 978, Vladimir was "the prince of all Rus'," although this is quite unlikely as we shall later observe. *RPCLT*, p. 93, remains true in translation to the *Laurentian* version; and *БЛДР* 1: 126–127, which reads: *одинъ*.

²⁶ Italics mine. *ПСРЛ* 2: 67.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 5: 112; and 20/1: 65.

the seat at Kiev, the distinction of being *ЕДИНЬ САМОДЕРЖЕЦЬ ВСЕЙ*, “the sole autocrat over all,”²⁸ and further of being *ВЕЛИКОДЕРЖАВНИЙ*, “all-powerful.”²⁹ The omission of *ЕДИНЬ*, “alone,” from a number of nearly contemporaneous annalistic texts, among them the numerous redactions of *H*,³⁰ coincides with the chronological issue concerning the inception of Vladimir’s rule. If Jakob is accurate in relating that Vladimir took the Kievan seat on 11 June 978, the disparity between his date and 980 (6488) in the *ПВА* might be explained as an inference in the latter source that until 980 the prince had not consolidated his authority and only then had almost complete dominion over the Kievan lands. His conquest of Kiev did not automatically entitle him to claim full sovereignty over the territories held by his forerunners; nor could he claim by the right of conquest to be the sole ruler over all Kievan lands. Rather, after taking the town, Vladimir had to demonstrate his personal strength and suitability to rule, and to reunite diverse Slavic and other tribes through the various political and military measures available to him. *ПВА-А* admits that in 981 (6489) Vladimir commenced a series of conquests and continued to do so in the following years:³¹

ИДЕ [ВОЛОДОМИРЪ] КЪ ЛАХЪМЪ И ЗАВЪ ГРАДЫ ѿ ПЕРЕМЫШЛЪ ЧЕРВЕНЪ И ИНЫ ГРАДЫ ЕЖЕ СУТЬ И ДО ЕГО ДНѢ ПОДЪ РУСЬЮ ВЪ СЕМЪ ЖЕ ЛѢТѢ И ВЪТЧИХЪ ПОБѢДН. И ВЪЗЛОЖИ НА НЬ ДАНЬ ѿ НАОУГА ЯКОЖЕ ШЦЬ ЕГО ИМАШЕ.

[Vladimir] went against the Ljaks and seized their towns: Peremyshl', Cherven, and other towns that are to this day under Rus'. In this year, he conquered the Vjatichi and imposed tribute upon them, as had his father *according to* [the number of] *ploughs*.

²⁸ Ibid., 21/1: 69.

²⁹ Ibid., 71.

³⁰ Ibid., 3 and 4; and the recent *Новгородская Первая Летопись Старшего и Малдшего Изводов*, *ibid.*, 3 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950; repr. Moscow, 2000): esp. 128, wherein the *Commission Text* reads: *И пакы* нача княжити Володомиръ в Киевѣ ..., “and *once more* Vladimir began to rule in Kiev ...” The question must be raised whether Vladimir had previously ruled in Kiev, which is doubtful, or has the scribe misstated by inserting the term *пакы*, since we have no evidence that Vladimir previously ruled in the town, unless the scribe is implying that he came to power two years earlier, then there was an interruption in his rule with no elaboration upon the specifics of this, and he again resumed rule. Perhaps more plausible is the argument that the *Novgorod Annal* is asserting that Vladimir had previously ruled Novgorod and now *again* was a ruler, but of Kiev.

Further, *N₄*, relates: *И нача княжити Володимеръ в Киевѣ* ..., “Vladimir began to rule in Kiev ...”

³¹ Italics mine. *ПСРЛ* 1: 81–82; *G*, *ibid.*, 5: 113; and *Тр*, p. 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 95; and *БЛДР* 1: 130–131.

The *Hypatian* redaction reads quite similarly:³²

Иде Володомъръ к Ляхомъ. и заа грады нхъ. Перемышль. Червенъ. и ныи
городаы. нже суть н до сего дне подъ Русью. семъ же лѣтъ н вѣтчи побѣди.
и възложи на нѣ дань. ѿ плуга. якъ же шць его ималъ.

Vladimir went against the Ljaks and seized their towns: Peremyshl', Cherven, and other towns that are to this day under Rus'. In this year he conquered the Vjatichi, and placed a tribute upon them *according to* [the number of] *ploughs*, as had his father.

A textual scrutiny of *ПВЛ* and other sources for the first century of Kievan Rus' history reveals that the dominion exercised by the Riurikid house, since its foundation ca. 860 (6368), was at best a tenuous political-economic arrangement with Eastern Slavic and other tribes. In his brief rule, Riurik (ca. 860–879), the semi-legendary founder of a political entity in northern Rus', had attempted Varangian political regulation, although his territorial expansion in that region was never extensive and was often tenuous in nature, for he was forced to compete with rival Varangian clans for political and economic interests. He asserted sovereignty over Novgorod and its territories, as well as over the towns of Polotsk, Rostov, Beloozero, and Murom.³³ To each of these fortified centers he assigned loyal lieutenants, princes, and boyars (*бояри*), men of aristocratic birth who initially were of Nordic stock, but also some who were of Slavic or of other national origins, that served him faithfully. S.G. Pushkarev notes that the *бояри* “did not constitute a definite order from the legal point of view but played an important role in the political and social life, along with the princes.”³⁴ Riurik's territorial

³² Italics mine. *ПСРЛ* 2: 69. The *Hypatian* rendition is repeated in *БЛДР* 1: 130–131. *Н*, *ПСРЛ* 3: 130, is very similar to this rendition; whereas *Н*, 4: 58; *П*, 5: 113; *В*, 7: 295; *ПН*, 9: 41; *В*, 21: 69; *НК*, 42: 43; and *Т*, 15: 75, read almost identically: Идѣ Володимеръ к Ляхомъ и заа грады нхъ, Перемышль, Червенъ и ныи грады, нже сють н до сего дни подъ Русью, “Vladimir went against the Ljaks and seized the towns of Peremyshl', Cherven, and other towns that to this day are under Rus'.” Similarly, *ВЛ*, *ibid.*, 30: 24. The passage is excised from *А*, 20/1: 65. No reference is made in these annals to the imposition of tribute upon them.

³³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 20; and 2: 14–15. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 59; and *БЛДР* 1: 74–75. To view the foundation of the Kievan Rus' state from another perspective, cf. M. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus', 1: From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, trans. Marta Skorupsky (Edmonton-Toronto, 1997): 294 ff. For a modern historiographic treatment of the complex questions raised by Hrushevsky, cf. M.V. Shostak, *Основні теорії утворення Київської Русі в Українознавчих дослідженнях XX-XXI століття* (Kiev, 2011), *passim*. More substantive and expansive are the articles in *Варяго-Русский вопрос в историографии*, ed. V.V. Fomin (Moscow, 2010).

³⁴ For the cited quotations, S.G. Pushkarev, *Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917*, eds. G. Vernadsky and R.T. Fisher, Jr. (New Haven and London, 1970),

acquisitions were held to be an integral part of clan property possessed in common and the lesser nobility were assigned towns chiefly for the defense of the region and the exploitation of their economic resources for commercial benefits and the raising of tribute as well as the production of revenue. This model, based not only on the Varangian structure of governance and economics, coexisted with the traditional Slavic tribal structure whose territorial bounds were often imprecise and led to frequent disputes over rights to land and its resources. It is these Varangians, mainly in the outlying north, and Slavic structures that Vladimir inherited and required his attention in order to solidify his position as the ruler at Kiev.

Soon after Riurik's death, Oleg, perhaps a relative although this is not clearly established in the sources, only that he was an elder,³⁵ was designated guardian for the former ruler's minor son, Igor. A puzzling question must be raised: Did Riurik have other sons by various women or none, or perhaps only daughters by them? It is plausible that if there were other sons, they might have expired by this time or had sought their fortunes elsewhere. However, the sources remain silent on the question of other sons and no inference can be made on this point. Further, no references in the annals or any other sources are made to daughters and their potentially significant marriages. Oleg, upon assuming the guardianship of Igor, gathered an army and set out to enlarge the Varangian Rus' domain. His conquests of Smolensk and to its south Ljubech were preparatory to his take over of Kiev. Oleg accordingly shifted the center of Varangian power from the north to the south, with the center the town on the Dnieper, and established for his ward and himself the principedom of Kiev. His actions may be, as Shepard suggests, "an attempt at secession from the other Rus' strongpoints ..." in the north.³⁶ But this move in 879 (6387) laid the formal foundation for the creation of a unified Kievan Rus' state centered at Kiev.

A twofold task confronted Oleg upon the assumption of rule in Kiev. As we have previously observed, he had participated in the consolidation of

pp. 4–5. For citations and references to the boyars, see *ИСРП* 1: 20; and 2: 14–15. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 59; and *БЛДР* 1: 74–77.

³⁵ J. Shepard, "The Origins of Rus' (c. 900–1015)," in *CHR*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 1 (Cambridge, 2006): 47–48, does not believe that Oleg was of princely stock, but rather he was a military commander. We have no other information to challenge Shepard's assertion, but we can only turn to the incomplete citation concerning Oleg in *ПБД*, wherein this source appears to allude to his noble birth, whatever the rank, since he occupied Kiev in the name of his ward Igor and asserted his superiority.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Riurikid authority over the peoples of northern Rus' or we must assume so, although archaeological evidence now points to the existence of numerous Varangian enclaves in northern Rus' that were neither politically nor economically linked to one another but functioned as competitive independent entities. The socio-political development of the Slavs, those settled in the provinces about Kiev, however, may not have been on par with those Slavs of the north and in particular the Varangians. Various princes, chieftains, and common local councils (*кѣчѣ*) ruled the southwestern Slavs. Their southeastern counterparts, having similar institutions, were under the nominal authority of Khazar *khagans* and were required to render annual tribute to them.³⁷ But the southeastern Slavic tribal groups appear to have exercised some degree of independence and therefore were not subject to the complete authority of the *khagans*. Oleg appears to have sought from the outset to deny to the Khazars their financial and material advantages gained from the Slavic tribes. He sought to secure for himself and his ward this annual income. Beginning in 883 and in successive years, he conquered neighboring Slavic tribes—the Drevljane, Sever, and Radimichi—and directed that they no longer render tribute to the Khazar *khagans*, but to him.³⁸ And in these Slavic lands Oleg directed the construction of fortified centers (*градь*) and in this manner he resolved his second problem—that of establishing a protective ring of fortifications in outlying areas to shield Varangian and Slavic commerce on the lower Dnieper from the depredations caused by nomadic incursions.³⁹

The political status of the Drevljane, Sever, and Radimichi after Oleg's subjugation of them was unlike that of the northern Slavs. These southern tribes were allowed to retain their socio-political institutions and Oleg was content to collect annual tribute from them and to acquire the services of their men in times of military conflict. With the construction of fortifications in their territories and the seating of lesser Varangian princes and boyars in these territorial centers,⁴⁰ Oleg situated the fortified centers in places where they most advantageously provided not only for local defense,

³⁷ Cf. M.N. Tikhomirov, *Древнерусские города* (2nd ed., rev. and enl., Moscow, 1956), *passim*. Noteworthy also and still useful is the earlier study of V. Parkhomenko, "Киевская Русь и Хазария," *С 6* (1927): 380–387.

³⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 23; and 2: 17. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 61; and *БЛДР* 1: 78–79.

³⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 23–24; 2: 17; *С*, 5: 89; and *Б*, 7: 269–270. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 61; and *БЛДР* 1: 78–79.

⁴⁰ Presniakov, *Княжое право*, p. 27. Cf. G. Laehr, *Die Anfänge des russischen Reiches. Politische Geschichte im 9. u. 10. Jahrhundert*, HS, heft 189 (Berlin, 1930): 33.

but also contributed to the overall protection of the Kievan state. He accordingly hastened the process of the political and commercial subordination of the surrounding countryside to the military outposts. A consequence of Oleg's military designs was the fragmentation of the subject Slavic tribes, and in the absence of stable territorial polities he was able to initiate the process of subverting any future claims that these Slavic tribal groups might make for an independent political life. In his own lifetime Oleg failed to bring about the creation of a stable unitary state. He sat as the surrogate for the young Igor and was the elder for the immediate Varangian family. The noble members of this kin continued to exercise their right to a common territorial heritage. The structure that emerges and remains the dominant form for the next century, of which the Rus' annalists were quite cognizant, is the creation of a heterogeneous political entity whose only tie to Kiev is the personal ability and military strength of the Kievan prince to wield his authority over and to hold together in a fashion the tributary peoples. Paradoxically, there is evidence that other Varangian kin operated independent of Riurik and Oleg about the perimeter of the Black Sea, seeking their own fortunes and material gains.⁴¹

⁴¹ Two examples bear attention. First, the legendary attack on Constantinople in 860 (6368) drew the considerable attention of A.A. Vasiliev in a seminal study: *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*, The Medieval Academy of America Pub. No. 46 (Cambridge, MA, 1946). Vasiliev, without making a clear attribution to a specific source, is inclined to link this attack to the Varangians, to Askold and Dir, the nominal rulers of Kiev whom Oleg later displaced and slew upon taking the town. The extensive sources for the period that he examines do appear to support his reasoning. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 64–70, and *passim*. A.A. Shaikin, *Повесть временных лет: История и поэтика* (Moscow, 2011), pp. 235–236 and n. 938, identifies Askold and Dir as *боярина*, lesser nobles. However, if we examine two prominent Byzantine works, cited below, this may not be the case. According to Greek accounts, a nameless renegade Varangian group that sought to make its mark in the Black Sea region had launched the attack on Constantinople. The leaders of this band are not identified, nor are their noble distinctions given, and the Rus' annals are the only sources to furnish the names of Askold and Dir, the nominal rulers of the Kievan khaganate. Also, it appears that the Byzantines were aware of other Varangian groups that preyed upon their coastal cities and towns in the Pontic littoral. The learned Photios, a former professor at the university in the imperial city, but then patriarch of Constantinople, relates in two homilies his limited knowledge of the Varangians who had attacked and whom he identifies as an obscure and insignificant nation of Rus' who have "now risen to a splendid height and immense wealth, a nation dwelling somewhere far from our country" Cited in C.A. Mango, trans., *The Homilies of Photios, Patriarch of Constantinople*, English Translation, Introduction and Commentary, DOS 3 (Cambridge, MA, 1958): 98. Cf. *ibid.*, *Homily III*: "Of the Same Most-Blessed Photius, Archbishop of Constantinople, First Homily on the Attack of the Russians," pp. 82–95; and *Homily IV*: "Of the Same Most-Blessed Photius, Archbishop of Constantinople, The New Rome, Second Homily on the Attack of the Russians," pp. 95–110. That Photios had no direct

Vladimir inherited a political legacy that necessitated that he, as his predecessors, reasserts his claim to tribute from the subject Slavs and other tribes. His grandfather, Igor (879?-945), was confronted with an immediate rebellion of the Drevljane, who exhibited strong separatist tendencies and refused to acknowledge his authority or to render tribute to him. Through a force of arms, Igor reestablished their tributary status and imposed a heavier, more exorbitant, charge upon them, perhaps because of his need to replenish his treasury and to compensate his men for the costs of the expedition.⁴² Nora K. Chadwick suggests and perhaps quite correctly that Igor increased the amount of tribute as a price for purchasing immunity for them from Pecheneg attacks.⁴³ In 945 (6453) the Drevljane again demonstrated their resistance to the centralizing efforts of the prince at Kiev and identified Varangian territorial and political ambitions with those of their ancient and mortal enemies, the Slavic Poljane, in whose territory the town of Kiev was situated. The Drevljane were thus responsible for the tragic death of Igor, and the Slavic princess Olga, his widow, became regent for their minor son

knowledge of the Varangian leaders at Kiev, nowhere referring to them by name, is puzzling. Granted, he dwells in these homilies upon religious themes and the moral implications for the Byzantines of the Rus' attack. For a further discussion of these issues, cf. W.K. Hanak, "Photios and the Slavs, 855-867," in *Acts. XVIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Selected Papers: Main and Communications. Moscow, 1991*, eds. I. Ševčenko, G.G. Litavrin, and W.K. Hanak, 1 (Shepherdstown, 1996): 253-256.

The second incident also involves a renegade group of Varangians, most probably from Kiev, although this is not conclusive, who operated independently in these early decades in the Black Sea region. Their exploits are treated by Soloviev, *История России*, pp. 135-138, and 306-307, nn. 163-173. Like Askold and Dir, the renegade Varangians had rejected the rule of Riurik and were permitted to leave the north to seek their fortunes in the south. Cf. Demin, pp. 226 ff.; and Hanak, *Origin, passim*.

On the complex issue of the early appearance of the Varangians about the Pontic littoral, cf. the substantive discussions of S.V. Tsvetkov, *Поход Русов на Константинополь в 860 году и начала Русу* (St. Petersburg, 2010), *passim*; and O. Karatay, "Karadeniz'de İlk Ruslar ve Şarkel'in İnşası [The First Rus' in the Black Sea and the Construction of Sarkel]," *Bellefen. Dört Ayda Bir Çıkar* 74/269 (2010): 71-111. For comparative purposes, addressing the issue of the early Varangians resident in areas beyond the recognized settlements in northwestern Rus' and the Kiev region, cf. Elena S. Galkina and A.P. Kuz'min, "Русский каганат и остров русов," in *Славяне и Русь: Проблемы и идеи* (Moscow, 1998), pp. 464-485.

One further issue needs to be raised. Askold and Dir, following their attack upon Constantinople according to popular and national histories, became Christians about 866. If correct, this is one of the earliest examples of the Christianization of Kievan rulers, albeit Varangians. On this, cf. Chupin, *Русь и религия*, pp. 28-34.

⁴² *ПСРЛ* 1: 42; and 2: 31-32. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 71; and *БЛДП* 1: 92-93.

⁴³ Nora K. Chadwick, *The Beginnings of Russian History: An Enquiry into Sources* (Cambridge, 1946; repr. 1966), p. 30.

Svjatoslav. She too found herself confronted with the need to reestablish orderly rule over the subject and tributary Slavs. She put down the Drevljane through a series of ruses and stratagems.⁴⁴ When later Svjatoslav came of age and assumed power in his own right, he had the good fortune of not having to expend great resources to subdue rebellious Slavic tribes in the south. He profited from the administrative and organizational skills of his mother.⁴⁵ She had completed the process of disjoining the Slavic lands and of incorporating them into an integral part of a centralized Kievan state and its administration. Olga denied to the Slavic tribes their own princes and designated one for each of them. She, in essence, concentrated princely power under the aegis of the Riurikid house. The provincial princes and boyars enjoyed only those powers that had been conferred upon them by her. Her son, Svjatoslav, by partitioning the Kievan state among his three sons, disrupted her centralizing efforts and the occasion again arose for the stronger Slavic tribes to rebel against Riurikid domination. Vladimir, upon coming to power, had to suppress not only the rebellion of the Vjatichi, but in 984 he had to establish the tributary status of the Radimichi.⁴⁶ Later, Vladimir's sons were free of many of the problems of internal insurrections, although they had to address several, and primarily concentrated their energies, focusing on external threats to their outlying interests.

The written sources provide no evidence that Vladimir's powers were defined by a written code, whether Varangian or Slavic, or a combination thereof, and in theory at least he enjoyed broad powers and exclusive sovereignty by the right of conquest. He was free to make new innovations, though these were hampered by kin tradition and tribal conventions that dictated how things were to be done. Thus, if there were any limitations upon his authority, and there appears to have been, these were dictated more so by customary laws practiced by the diverse Varangian and Slavic groupings, some of tribal origin and others probably inherited by the kin. There were occasions, as we shall note, for conflicts to emerge between the adherents of Slavic and Varangian customary laws that in a number of respects were antithetical to one another and did not share common

⁴⁴ For a vivid description of Olga's skillful attempts at the humiliation and destruction of Drevljanian resistance, cf. the legendary accounts in *ПВЛ, ПСРЛ* 1: 56–60; and 2: 46–49. Also, *RPCLT*, pp. 80–82; and *БЛДР* 1: 104–107.

⁴⁵ Presniakov, *Княжое право*, pp. 25–28; A. Stender-Petersen, *Die Varägersage als Quellen der altrussischen Chronik*, *AJ* 6 (Copenhagen, 1934): 126 ff.; and B.D. Grekov, *Киевская Русь* (Moscow, 1949), p. 300.

⁴⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 83–84; and 2: 71. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 96; and *БЛДР* 1: 132–133.

interests. The compilers of *ПВЛ* elaborate upon two such events during the period of his pagan rule to demonstrate his authority.

Until Vladimir's accession, the pagan Varangian and Slavic elements dominated not only the political, but as well the religious life of Kievan Rus'.⁴⁷ According to *ПВЛ*, the *Laurentian* redaction,⁴⁸ in the same year (here the date is determined to be 980 rather than the earlier year of 978 according to Jakob) that he began his rule in Kiev, Vladimir

... постави кумиры на холму· внѣ двора теремнаго· Перуна древа· а главу его
сребрену· а оусть златъ· и Хърсѣ Дажьбѣ· и Стрибѣ· и Симарьглѣ· и Мокосъ
[и] жрѣху имъ наричюще я [о]г[ы]· [и] прикожаху сны своимъ и дъщерь· и жрѣху
бѣгомъ· [и] оубвернахъ землю теремамъ своимъ· и оубверниша кровемъ земля
Руска· и холмо—тъ по пребѣгши Бѣ не хотѣ смръть грѣшникомъ· на тѣмъ холмѣ
нынѣ цркъ [в]и стонть· стго Василия есѣ·

... erected idols on a hill beyond the castle chamber: a wooden Perun with his head of silver and a mustache of gold, and Khors, Dazh'bog, Stribog, Simar'gl, and Mokosh. They sacrificed to them, calling them gods, and *they brought their sons and daughters and sacrificed [them]* to the demons. They defiled the land with their offerings and profaned the Rus' land and the hill with blood. But the most blessed God did not wish the death of sinners and on this hill now stands a church. It is [that] of Saint Basil.

This passage merits further comment. It is noteworthy because we see the scribes admitting that Vladimir, recognizing the increasing role of the Slavs in political and military matters, found it advantageous to grant to the Slavs a greater participatory role in the affairs of the state. Through his religious leadership, albeit at first pagan, he strengthened the political

⁴⁷ For an extended discussion of the Scandinavian and Slavic deities worshipped by the Kievan Rus'; on the eve of their Christianization, cf. Marija Gimbutas, "Ancient Slavic Religion: A Synopsis," in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday 11 October 1966*, 1 (The Hague-Paris, 1967): 741–759. Cf. I. Garcia de la Puente, "The Indo-European Heritage in the Povest' Vremennykh Let," in *Culture and Identity in Eastern Christian History. Papers from the First Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture (ASEC), Inc., October 21–22, 2005 at The Ohio State University*, eds. R.E. Martin and Jennifer B. Spock, Ohio Slavic Papers 9/Eastern Christian Studies 1 (Columbus, 2009): esp. 54 ff.

⁴⁸ Italics mine. *ПСРЛ* 1: 79; *Н*, 3: 128; *В*, 7: 294; *ПН*, 9: 40; *А*, 20/1: 65; *НН*, 42: 43; *Т*, 15: 73; *ВЛ*, 30: 24; *Ник* (Zenkovsky), 1: 76 and 77; *Тр*, p. 93; and *RPCLT*, p. 93, preserve the phrase: "The people ... brought their sons and their daughters for sacrifice." Further, Shaikin, p. 106 and n. 522, raises the issue of whether these deities were in fact common to the diverse and multi-ethnic Rus'. There is no easy explanation, given the absence of sufficient literary and archaeological evidence, for his suspicion of non-commonality aside from the age-old traditional practices of worshipping diverse deities.

unity of the Kievan people. B.D. Grekov interprets the event as evidence of the introduction of princely autocratic powers.⁴⁹ But in the minds of the Christian annalists, the occurrence was a sign that Vladimir in the future could also be expected to protect the interests of the neophyte Christian church and give this institution direction and resources at crucial moments in the daily lives of the Rus'.

While we have observed in the Laurentian redaction of *ПВЛ* and other annals the admission that both young boys and girls were sacrificed to the pagan deities, the Hypatian redaction emends the passage and deletes any reference to the sacrifice of girls.⁵⁰ This is, perhaps, one of the earliest examples of textual emendation to reflect customary laws then still practiced in southwestern Rus', unlike some of the customary practices found among the southeastern Rus'.

Soon after Vladimir centralized religious worship, this being the first evidence in Rus' sources to establish an official state religion and to create a common Varangian-Slavic pagan pantheon at an esteemed site of worship, it appears that an awareness came upon him of the inadequacies of the pagan cults. Paganism as a state institution throughout Europe was endangered because it was deemed to be inferior and had quite primitive practices, whereas Christianity, whether of the Byzantine or Roman rites, demonstrated its superiority in that its theology and ritualistic practices enjoyed higher esteem and official recognition. According to the traditional account related in *ПВЛ* for 986, following his defeat at the hands of the Volga Bulgars who then sent an Islamic mission to Kiev to convert him and his people to their religion, Vladimir countered by consulting with religious emissaries from Christian countries—Latin representatives from the Holy Roman Empire and Eastern Christian churchmen from Byzantium, the

⁴⁹ Grekov, *Киевская Русь*, pp. 381, 468, and 471–472. A.E. Presniakov, *Лекции по русской истории*, 1 (Moscow, 1938): 105, emphasizes the political ramifications of this pagan activity. On the other hand, N. Zernov, "Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church," *SEER* 28 (1949–1950): 425, maintains that religion was an important weapon in Vladimir's arsenal of tools for the expansion and consolidation of his domains.

⁵⁰ *ПСРЛ* 2: 67, reads: и постави кумиры на холъмѹ. вѣнѣ двора теремнѣ. Перуна деревнѣна. голова его серебряна. а оугъ золѣ. и Хорьга. и Дажьбѣ. и Стрѣбѣ. и Сѣмарьга. и Мобошь. и Жрѣхѹ нмѣ. наричуще бѣгы. и прибожаху сны свои. и жрѣху бѣгомѣ. и шквѣрнѣху землю требами своимѣ. и шквѣрнѣ требами землѣ Рѹскаѣ. и холмѣ тѣ. Но прѣбѣгыи Бѣ не хотѣи смѣрти грѣшникѣ. на томѣ холмѣ нынѣ црк[в]ы есть сѣго вѣснѣа. Italics mine. Also, we encounter repetition in *Л*, 20/1: 65, with some textual revision; and *БЛДР* 1: 126–127, but without any additional comment. The facsimile edition of Pritsak, *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles*, p. 34, preserves this textual rendition.

Muslim Volga Bulgars (on his terms), and Jewish Khazars. He then sent leading men to each of their countries to observe their religious customs and practices, and to learn more about their creed.⁵¹ The following year the account notes that Vladimir was unable to arrive at a decision on which creed to adopt. He summoned his nobles and town-elders (*старци градъскѣи*) with whom he consulted and discussed the teachings and practices of each religious faith. With the concurrence of his nobles and elders, he arrived at a decision to dispatch ten Rus' legates to study the teachings and rituals of three religious groupings. The ten Rus' comprised only of Slavs, excluding Varangians from among his retinue who remained in the large strong proponents of paganism. And paradoxically, although no explanation is furnished in *ПВЛ*, Vladimir directed his men to visit the Volga Bulgars, Germans, and Byzantines, but he excluded the Jewish Khazars. Perhaps even at this late date, although their state was in ruins following the assaults of Svjatoslav, the Khazars may have continued to claim territorial sovereignty and maintained an influence over portions of southern Rus', including Kiev; as well, they may have attempted to exercise the right to collect tribute from the Slavic tribes occupying these lands. Understandably, Vladimir had no intention to humble himself to the overlordship of a Khazar khagan.⁵²

Upon the return of his servants, Vladimir again summoned and assembled his nobles and elders. He listened to their reports and then addressed those assembled: *ИДЕМЪ КРЩЕНЬЕ ПРИМЕМЪ· ОНИ ЖЕ РЕКОША ГДѢ ТИ ЛЮБО*, "from where shall we accept baptism; they replied wherever you wish."⁵³ The nobles and elders had relinquished this decision to him not because they were unable to come to a resolution of the matter, but rather within their own territories strong pagan elements were highly influential and it would have been folly for them to select a religion of choice, thus bringing censure upon themselves and the prospect of relinquishing their own authority.

⁵¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 84–106; 2: 71–92; and esp. *К*, 21/1: 74–88. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 96–110; and *БЛДР* 1: 132–153 and 502–504. Cf. V. Minorsky, *Sharafal-Zamān Tāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks and India* (London, 1942), p. 36; Tatishchev, 2: 58–61; Likhachev, *Русские летописи*, pp. 39–40; and D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453* (New York-Washington, 1971; repr., London, 2000), p. 194.

⁵² *ПСРЛ* 1: 107; and 2: 93. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 110; and *БЛДР* 1: 152–153. On the process of re-religionization of Kievan Rus', cf. L.N. Gumilev, *Древняя Русь и великая степь* (Moscow, 1992), pp. 251–256.

⁵³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 108; and 2: 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 111; and *БЛДР* 1: 154–155. *Н*, *ПСРЛ* 3: 150, with some textual alteration, reads: *ТО КДѢ БРЕЩЕННІЕ ПРИМЕМЪ. ОНИ ЖЕ РѢША: ГДѢ ТИ ЛЮБО*; also *Н*, 4: 80; *С*, 5: 117; *В*, 7: 307; *ПН*, 9: 53; *Т*, 15: 102; *А*, 20/1: 77; *К*, 21/1: 88–92; *ВЛ*, 30: 34; *НВ*, 42: 51; and *Тр*, p. 109.

These detailed passages explaining the Christianization of Kievan Rus' should be treated with circumspection. Much of the information is traditional in character and replete with exaggerations. But legends often have some basis in fact and the consultation with and the visits to the Volga Bulgars, Germans, and Byzantines should be understood in another context. Vladimir was sufficiently perceptive to notice that his official pagan cults stood in opposition to advanced religious trends and as an inharmonious island among the Christians on the west and south, and to the east were to be found the Muslims and Jewish Khazars. Kievan Rus' was an important commercial link between Europe and Asia and at the crossroads of assorted cultures, religious ideas, and practices. That he could even consider the adoption of another religion for his principality is evidence that he enjoyed far greater personal authority than his predecessors upon the Kievan seat. His grandmother Olga, who could only undertake a personal conversion to Byzantine Christianity ca. 955 (6463),⁵⁴ had neither sufficient

⁵⁴ The place and date of Olga's baptism are confused in the sources and there remains no clear consensus among scholars in their interpretations of this event. The primary accounts, in essentials repeated in the cited annals for the year 955 except in *HK* where the year is given as 958 (6466), describing her conversion are *ПВЛ, ИСРЛ* 1: 60–62; and 2: 49–51; *RPCLT*, pp. 82–83; *БЛДР* 1: 110–113; Georgios Kedrenos, *Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB 2 (Bonn, 1839): 329; and the first-hand observations of Adalbert, bishop of Trier, who visited Kiev in 959 and whose accounts are included in the *Continuator Regionis*, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum* (Hanover, 1890), p. 170. Adalbert assigns the date of her conversion to 957 and the place where the baptism took place as Constantino-ple. Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, pp. 594 ff. (II.15), makes no direct reference to Olga's conversion on the occasion of her visit to the imperial city. The modern scholarly assumption is that her baptism took place elsewhere, most probably in Kievan Rus'. Cf. the editions in PG 112: 1108 ff.; and of Vogt. For critical commentaries on Kedrenos's work, cf. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*, 1 (2nd ed., Munich, 1897): 368–369; and Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica, 1: Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker*, Berliner Byzantinischen Arbeiten 10 (2nd ed., Berlin, 1958): 273–275. For the work of Constantine Porphyrogenetos, cf. Moravcsik, 1: 356–390. Also for a brief reference, cf. *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. Thurn, CFHB 5 (Berlin, 1973), ch. 6 (p. 240); and *John Scylitzes: A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*, trans. J. Wortley (Cambridge, 2010), ch. 6 (p. 231 and n. 31). For a source discussion, cf. M.V. Bibikov, *Byzantinorossica. Свод византийских свидетельств о Руси*, 1 (Moscow, 2004), 74–81.

Mel'nikova, pp. 117–122, esp. 120–121, scrutinizes Olga's two visits to the imperial city, the first in 946, a result of the on-going disputes concerning commercial relations and their conclusion following the conflict between Byzantium and Kievan Rus' two years earlier. The second visit occurred 954/955, at which time she was baptized. Mel'nikova's focus is upon the account of the latter visit related in Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Administrando Imperio*, eds. Gy. Moravcsik and R.J.H. Jenkins, CFHB 1/DOT 1 (rev., Washington, 1967; 2nd. rev. ed., Washington, 2009); *Об управлении империей*, eds. G.G. Litavrin and A.P. Novosel'tsev

political strength and support, nor sufficient authority as a regent to bring about a major religious transformation. She also never had a favorable political climate within her court to garner the support of pagan Varangian and Slavic elements for religious conversion. The populace was generally swayed by the upper classes and pagan priests to oppose her efforts for religious change. Yet, in spite of these and other hindrances, Olga persisted in her belief that she was pursuing the correct course to associate herself with Byzantium both politically and religiously, for the evolving political, economic, and religious scene was moving in her favor, however slowly, and thus dictated this need to her. And the presence of Christian elements among the

(Moscow, 1989). Among the secondary sources, notable are the works of G.G. Litavrin, “Путешествие русской княгини Ольги в Константинополь. Проблема источников,” *ВВ* 42 (1981): 35–48; S. Zukerman, “Le voyage d’Olga et la première ambassade espagnole à Constantinople en 946,” *Travaux et Mémoires* 13 (2000): 647–672; and M. Featherstone, “Olga’s Visit to Constantinople in De Cerimoniis,” *REB* 61 (2003): 241–251. For an incisive examination of the extant literature on Olga, her baptism, and visits, especially to Constantinople, cf. Nazarenko, ch. 5.

Further, a number of modern Russian historians have maintained that her baptism took place in Kiev in the year 955. They prefer to minimize the evidence that implies that her baptism occurred in Constantinople and the specific reference that appears in the *Память и похвала князю Владимиру*, V.I. Sreznevsky, “Память и похвала кн. Владимиру,” pp. 2–3: *Взиска спийла и приа ш бѣбѣ своен Ѡлзѣ, како шѣши къ Црѣгородѣ, и прѣла баше стое крѣнїе, и пожи добрѣ пре[дѣ] Бѣмѣ, ксимн добрымн дѣлы Украиншнса и почн с мирома ш Хѣ Ісѣ и къ блѣзѣ вѣнѣ,* “the gallop to salvation and [his] descent from [his] grandmother Olga, who went to Constantinople and had received holy baptism, and lived virtuously before God, was adorned with all good deeds, and reposed in peace for Jesus Christ and in the blessed faith.” Cf. *ibid.*, p. 4f: *Похвала княгинѣ Ѡлги, како крѣтиса и добрѣ поживе по заповѣдн Гѣи*, and *supra*, n. 18, for other variant texts. Jacob asserts that Olga had been a Christian for fifteen years prior to her death in 969 (6477). The date of conversion could either be 954 or 955, depending upon the calendar used by Jacob for his calculations, albeit a Byzantine calendar that underwent some revision and variant usage in the tenth century. The recent scholarship of Laehr, pp. 103–105; F. Dvornik, *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization* (Boston, 1956), pp. 200–201; and D. Obolensky, “The Empire and Its Northern Neighbors, 565–1018,” in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, 4: *The Byzantine Empire*, Part 1: *Byzantium and Its Neighbors*, eds. Jane M. Hussey, D.M. Nicol, and G. Cowan (Cambridge, 1966): 511, agree that the event took place in 957 in the imperial city. Cf. the analysis of this controversial topic in *RPCLT*, pp. 239–240. For an extensive discussion of the chronological complexities found in *ПВЛ*, cf. S.V. Tsyb, *Древнерусское времяисчисление в «Повести временных лет»* (2nd ed., amended, St. Petersburg, 2011), *passim*. But more recently, Poppe, “Once Again Concerning the Baptism of Olga,” pp. 271–277, studies the western sources and concludes that her conversion took place closer to 955 (6463), although he admits that the time and place of baptism cannot be fixed with any precision because of the confusion of the evidence in the sources. Cf. in his notes the extensive bibliography on the subject. We are also confronted with her visit to Otto I. On this, cf. D. Gordiyenko, “The Mission of Kyivan Princess Ol’ga to the King Otto I in the Context of Rus’ and Germany[:] Foreign Policies,” *Bs* 66 (2008): 107–118.

upper and some lower class Varangians and Slavs must have further motivated her to pursue this course of action. Thus the consideration of another creed by the Kievan prince, aware of all the positive and negative intangibles that had confronted his grandmother, was in itself a revolutionary step in the advancement of Kievan Rus'. But also Vladimir must have been aware of the political and religious confrontations that his grandmother had experienced. He recognized that without the encouragement and acquiescence of Slavic and Varangian nobles and elders, he could not introduce conversion. Yet, at the same time *ПРА* stresses that the nobles and elders conceded this decision to him.⁵⁵ An explanation of why the regional nobles and elders conceded the decision to the prince, although they may have favored the change, may be found in the fact that they were aware of the strength of local pagan influences and did not wish to surrender their personal authority at the local level.

Even though the adoption of Byzantine Christianity was an event of paramount significance for early Kievan Rus' history, the accounts of Vladimir's conversion are incomplete and the little information that has been preserved is imprecise. His baptism appears to have occurred either in 987 or 988 (6495 or 6496) and took place either in Kiev, on one of his estates, or even elsewhere.⁵⁶ Among the Scandinavian sagas, a tradition has been preserved

⁵⁵ Cf. A.P. Novosel'tsev, et al., *Древнерусское государство и его международное значение* (Moscow, 1965), p. 16.

⁵⁶ There exists a substantial literature on Vladimir's conversion and the questions attendant to it. Among the more important sources, and by no means is this intended to be a complete list, are Makarii, *История русской церкви*, 1: 274–309; Filaret, archbishop of Chernigov, *История русской церкви* (5th ed., St. Petersburg, 1894), pp. 23–27; Golubinsky, 1: 246–256; Shakhmatov, *Разыскания*, pp. 133–161; N. de Baumgarten, *Saint Vladimir et la conversion de la Russie*, OCA 79 (Rome, 1932): *passim*; G. Fedotov, "Le baptême de Saint Vladimir et la conversion de la Russie," *Irénikon* 15 (1938): 417–435; H. Koch, "Byzanz, Ochrid und Kiev, 987–1037. Zur Wiederkehr des angeblichen Taufjahres (988–1938)," *Kyrios* 3 (1938): 253–292; Presniakov, *Лекции*, 1: 98 ff.; V. Laurent, "Aux Origines de l'Eglise Russe. L'établissement de la Hiérarchie byzantine," *EO* 38 (1939): 279–295; V.A. Parkhomenko, "Характер и значение эпохи Владимира, принявшего христианства," *УЗЛУ* 73, *серия исторических наук, вып. 8* (1941): 203–214; G. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (New Haven, 1948), pp. 62 ff.; Grekov, *Киевская Русь*, pp. 468–471; Paszkiewicz, *Origin*, p. 43 ff.; *idem*, *The Making of Russia* (London, 1963), p. 103 f.; A. Poppe, *Państwo i kościół na Rusi w XI wieku* (London, 1963), pp. 16 ff.; and A.P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 256 ff. More recently, cf. A. Poppe, "St. Vladimir as a Christian," in *The Legacy of St. Vladimir: Byzantium, Russia, America. Papers Presented at a Symposium Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, Crestwood NY, September 27-October 1, 1988*, eds. J. Breck, J. Meyendorff, and E. Silk (Crestwood, 1990), pp. 41–46; A. Poppe, "How the Conversion of Rus' Was Understood in the Eleventh

that Olaf Tryggvason, en route to Norway from Byzantium, passed through Kievan Rus' in 987 or 988, and was accompanied by a Byzantine bishop named Paul who performed the baptismal ceremony.⁵⁷ How credible this claim is remains a subject of disputation among scholars, although we should tender some credence to this account in view of the frequent contacts between the Varangians and Slavs. Too, a number of high Scandinavian nobles make their appearance in Kievan Rus' throughout the course of this early period. The Scandinavian account does not state the place where the baptism took place and appears to leave the impression that it occurred in Kiev, although this is by no means conclusive and the event could have taken place elsewhere.

Byzantine sources are equally reticent on Vladimir's conversion, or dismiss it with little comment. If anything, they treat the matter as a minor event and of no great consequence for Byzantine interests in Kievan Rus'. That they relegated the conversion of Vladimir to an almost insignificant occurrence is, therefore, not surprising. For the Constantinopolitan ruler, Basil II, more important was the acquisition of military forces to quell the internal problems of the empire and especially his struggle with the rival Bardas Phokas.⁵⁸

The Christianization of Vladimir and his subjects and the establishment of this creed as the state religion are important in another context. *ПВЛ* copyists and other early Rus' writers draw extensively, but selectively, upon the now introduced translated Old Testament texts into Old Church Slavonic and formulated a historiographic tradition and a modified concept of rulership based upon their reading and understanding of the texts. There appears in *ПВЛ* a striking parallel between the achievements of Vladimir and Solomon,⁵⁹ the king of Israel (ca. 974–ca. 937 BC) and the son of David.

Century," *HUS* 11 (1987): 287–302; repr. in *idem*, *Christian Russia in the Making*, essay III; Gumilev, pp. 266–270; D.G. Ostrowski, "The Account of Volodimer's Conversion in the *Povest' vremennykh let*: A Chiasmus of Stories," *HUS* 28, nos. 1–4 (2006): 567–580; and most recently, Raffensperger, pp. 159 ff. For a good historiographic and source analysis of Vladimir's baptism, cf. E.V. Klimov, *Религиозная реформа великого киевского князя Владимира I и христианизация древней Руси* (Tver', 2010), ch. 1.

⁵⁷ *The Saga of King Olaf Tryggvason Who Reigned over Norway A.D. 995 to A.D. 1000*, trans. J. Sephton (London, 1895), pp. 93–97; N. de Baumgarten, *Olaf Tryggvason roi de Norvège et ses relations avec Saint Vladimir de Russie*, OC 24/1 (Rome, 1931); and Novosel'tsev, p. 106.

⁵⁸ On this, cf. Poppe, "How the Conversion of Rus' Was Understood in the Eleventh Century," pp. 287 ff.

⁵⁹ On the contrast of the reigns of Vladimir and Solomon, cf. W.K. Hanak, "Vladimir I: The New Solomon," *Византиноведение 3: Origins and Outcomes: Byzantine Heritage in Rus'. For*

The subsequent analogies that are entered in *ПВЛ* are mainly drawn from the Old Testament *Books of Kings* and *Books of Chronicles*. David is frequently cited in the Old Testament and *ПВЛ* in the image of an ideal king, while his son and Vladimir are measured according to this standard. *ПВЛ* not surprisingly is in the main, given the fact that the copyists were of an Eastern Christian spiritual order, a religious history of early Rus' and with this principle in mind the copyists carefully selected those events in Solomon's life that would be illustrative of the similarity between Vladimir's rule and that of the biblical monarch.

The *ПВЛ* entry for 980 (6488) relates in extensive detail the circumstances of their respective rise to power and noted that both Vladimir and Solomon were libertines, each having an insatiable taste for young girls and married women.⁶⁰ But the annalist in his citation further elaborates:⁶¹

ТѢ МУДРЫЯ ЖЕ БѢ А НАКОНЕЦЪ ПОГНЕБѢ СЕ ЖЕ БѢ НЕВѢГЛОЛОЗЪ А НАКОНЕЦЪ ШЕРѢТЕ
СННЬЕ

He [Solomon] was wise, but in the end he was ruined. He [Vladimir] was an ignoramus, but in the end he found salvation.

The textual explanation given for providential intervention in Vladimir's behalf and the eventual denunciation of Solomon is that **ВЕЛИИ ГЪ И ВЕЛИИ ГРЪПОСТЬ ЕГО И РАЗУМУ ЕГО НѢ КОНЦА** "great is the Lord and great is His power, and His wisdom is without end."⁶²

There follows in *ПВЛ* a Hebrew acrostic on a virtuous wife⁶³ that contains some political admonitions. A good wife makes for her husband scarlet

Professor Ihor Medvedev, the Corresponding Member of the RAS on His 70th Birthday/Истоки и последствия: Византийское наследие на Руси. Сборник статей к 70-летию члена-корреспондента РАН И. П. Медведева (2005): 102–115; and G. Stökl, "Der zweite Salomon. Eine Bemerkungen zur Herrschervorstellung im alten Rußland," in *idem, Der russische Staat in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Wiesbaden, 1981), pp. 23–31. F. Butler, *Enlightener of Rus': The Image of Vladimir Sviatoslavich across the Centuries* (Bloomington, IN, 2002), p. 21, accepts without question that Jaroslav the Wise succeeded his father Vladimir "as Solomon succeeded David" Francis Butler makes no effort to extract from *ПВЛ* the pertinent passages that liken Vladimir to Solomon.

⁶⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 80; and 2: 67. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 94; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129.

⁶¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 80; 2: 67–68; *Н₁*, 3: 129; *Н₄*, 4: 56–57; *С₁*, 5: 113; *В₁*, 7: 294; *ПН*, 9: 41; *Т₁*, 15: 73–74; *А*, 20/1: 66; *В_А*, 30: 24; *Н_К*, 42: 43; and *Т_р*, p. 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 94; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129. Also, Shaikin, p. 106.

⁶² *ПСРЛ* 1: 80; 2: 68; *Н₁*, 3: 129; *Н₄*, 4: 57; *С₁*, 5: 113; *В₁*, 7: 294; *ПН*, 9: 41; *Т₁*, 15: 74; *А*, 20/1: 66; *В_А*, 30: 24; *Н_К*, 42: 43; and *Т_р*, p. 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 94; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129 and 501. Also, Shaikin, p. 106.

⁶³ *Proverbs* 31. 10–13; *ПСРЛ* 1: 80–81; and 2: 68–69. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 94–95; and *BLDR* 1: 128–129 and 501.

robes and for herself robes of purple. In biblical tradition the color scarlet is reserved for royalty or the very rich;⁶⁴ Byzantine tradition, however, reserves the color purple for the imperial family. The Kievan princes at this stage in their history are not noted for adopting in their dress the color purple or scarlet.

Students of the Kievan period, drawing upon the Byzantine political model with the reception of their brand of Christianity, have generally argued that the early Rus' annalists favored autocracy, perhaps after the Byzantine model, as an ideal form of government for the Kievan Rus', but the inclusion of this acrostic seeks to dispel this notion and stresses that⁶⁵

... ВЗОРЕНЪ БЫВАЕТЕ БО БРАТѢХЪ МУЖЬ СЯ' ВНЕГДА ЛИЦЕ СѢДЕТЬ НА СОВѢЩАН' СЪ
СТАРИИ И СЪ ЖИТЕЛИ ЗЕМЛИ'

... her husband is distinguished within the gates when he sits in council with the elders and the inhabitants of the land.

The inclusion of this Hebrew verse composition under the year 980, the year in which *ПБЛ* claims that Vladimir's dominion commenced and he ruled alone, is an admission if not a contradiction of the statement concerning autocracy, that is, he was the sole ruler. The Hebrew acrostic is rather an acknowledgement that the annalists advocated a system of rule combining princely authority with elements of aristocracy and the popular representation of elders and the inhabitants of the land in council. This appears to be a straightforward admission that Vladimir did not enjoy sole rule as an autocrat, but that there were limitations upon his powers in that he had to heed the advice and perhaps even seek the counsel and consent of the aristocracy and popular representatives regarding crucial matters. The annalists appear to be cognizant of the traditional political processes that had evolved in tribal society in the earlier centuries. Too, they were motivated to preserve regional and tribal political associations to enhance their missionary activities and Christianization efforts in those areas.

In the same year that Vladimir rose to power with the aid of Varangian mercenaries from Scandinavia and Slavs from northern Rus', he selected from their number МУЖИ ДОБРЫ' СМЫСЛЕНЫ И ДОБРЫ⁶⁶ И РАЗДАВА ИМЪ ГРАДЫ'

⁶⁴ *II Samuel* i. 24; and *Jeremiah* iv. 30.

⁶⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 81; 2: 68; *Н₁*, 3: 129; *Н₄*, 4: 57; *С₁*, 5: 113; *В*, 7: 295; *Т*, 15: 74; but the entire acrostic is excised from *ВЛ*, 30: 24; *НВ*, 42: 43; and *ТФ*, p. 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 95; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129.

“good, wise, and *brave*⁶⁶ men, and assigned them to fortified centers.”⁶⁷ These men, with a strong link to paternal ancestry and preservation of family blood lines but personally loyal to the Kievan prince, came to constitute a part of his retinue (*дружина*) and were a source of his power for governing outlying fortified centers and the surrounding countryside. The retinue was an essential element in his patronage mechanism that also protected the Kievan prince from external enemies, put down internal uprisings, and performed essential administrative and judicial functions within their assigned jurisdictions. Thus the retinue came to be regarded as essential for the maintenance of political, economic, and military stability in a land known for disputations among ruling elite and tribal units. And in 987 when Vladimir deliberated upon the adoption of a new religion for his state, he consulted with them, seeking their approval and support, knowing well that they understood popular sentiments in their respective regions. His retinue, then, was a source of his strength in governing Kievan Rus', but they also emerge as a limitation upon his claim to autocratic powers. In essence, the retinue exercised influences upon the prince, thus placing boundaries upon or advancing modifications to his decisions.⁶⁸

The application of biblical historical narrative by drawing upon significant phrases during Solomon's monarchic rule and contrasting these with Vladimir's achievements, or so we are led to believe, enabled the Rus' annalists to disassociate the prince's pagan past from the period of his Christian rule. Through a selective citation of the Hebrew king's achievements, they drew parallels, demonstrating the similarity in the accomplishments of each. The scribes of the *Books of Kings* and the *Books of Chronicles* and the compilers of the *ПРЛ* set out to formulate the idealized notion that the reigns of Solomon and Vladimir were most flourishing and were pacific.

⁶⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 79. The term *добры*, “good,” herein, is repetitive and therefore a textual corruption and should rather read *храбры*, “brave,” as it appears in other redactions, e.g., *ПСРЛ* 2: 66; *Н*, 3: 128; *Н*, 4: 56; *С*, 5: 112; *В*, 7: 294; *ПН*, 9: 40; *Т*, 15: 72; *НК*, 42: 43; and *Тр*, p. 93. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 93, wherein the text is corrected; and *БЛДР* 1: 126–127.

⁶⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 79; 2: 66; *Н*, 3: 128; *Н*, 4: 56; *С*, 5: 112; *В*, 7: 294; *ПН*, 9: 40; and *Т*, 15: 72; but not stated in *ВЛ*, 30: 24; *НК*, 42: 43; and *Тр*, p. 93. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 93; and *БЛДР* 1: 126–127.

⁶⁸ Cf. S.M. Soloviev, *Исторія отношеніи между русскими князьями рюрикава дома* (Moscow, 1847), p. 41; and V.A. Romanov, *Люди и нравы древней Руси (Историко-бытовые очерки XI-XIII вв.)* (2nd ed., Moscow-Leningrad, 1966; repr., Moscow, 2002), pp. 119 ff. Also I.M. Trotsky, “Элементы дружиной идеологии в ‘Повести Временных Лет,’” *Пу* 17 (1936): 17–45 (note in particular pp. 26–27 for the role of the *дружина*); and S. Franklin, “Kievan Rus' (1015–1125),” in *CHR* 1 (Cambridge, 2006), esp. 81–82.

The Rus' annalists provide a number of examples to support their contention. While the rule of Solomon spanned forty years, that of Vladimir endured either for thirty-five or thirty-seven years. As we have noted above, this chronological disparity depends on when historians, based on the contradictory sources, assume that Vladimir came to power. Aside from this disparity, we read in the Old Testament accounts that Solomon detested military enterprises and was content to preserve the existing borders that he had inherited from his father David. Solomon, however, did acquire additional territory through diplomacy and foreign marriages. On the other hand, Vladimir, given his commercial, diplomatic, and military needs, began to enlarge his state. In 981 (6489) he advanced against the Ljawks, seizing the Red cities of Peremyshl', Cherven, along with others in central Galicia.⁶⁹ These conquests guaranteed to the Rus' commercial access to the Vistula basin and its lucrative trade routes, markets, and products. With the support of his uncle Dobrynja, Vladimir four years later marched upon the Volga Bulgars.⁷⁰ The prince sought in this confrontation to establish his dominion over the upper Volga region, and again his motive appears to have been to acquire commercial advantages and to increase his revenues mainly in the form of tribute. *ПБД* relates of a military campaign that took place in 992 (6490). He attacked the White Croats who inhabited the provinces of Bukovina and Eastern Galicia. These areas had inhibited his free access to the Vistula and it was essential that he bring them within his sphere of authority.⁷¹ *ПБД*, in recounting these conquests, stresses that once Vladimir adopted Christianity, he made his frontiers more secure by allying himself with Christian neighbors, as the Poles, Germans, Balkan Bulgarians, Byzantines, among others. Hence the emphasis is that as Solomon had lived in

⁶⁹ For the text of this statement, cf. *supra*, citation and accompanying nn. 31 and 32. *БЛДР* 1: 501, addresses the geographical mislocations.

⁷⁰ From the initial assault upon the Ljawks to that of the attack upon the Volga Bulgars, Vladimir in the meantime also launched military attacks upon the Vjatichi, Jatvjagi, and Radimichi. *ПСПЛ* 1: 81–84; 2: 69–71; *Н₁*, 3: 130–132; *Н₄*, 4: 58–60; *С₁*, 5: 113–114; *Б₁*, 7: 295–296; *ПН*, 9: 41–42; *Т*, 15: 75–77; *БЛ*, 30: 24–25; and *НН*, 42: 43–44. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 96; and *БЛДР* 1: 132–133 and 501–502. On the distinctions between the Volga and Balkan Bulgars, cf. Laehr, pp. 143–144.

⁷¹ *ПСПЛ* 1: 122; 2: 106; *Н₁*, 3: 165, simply notes that he went against the Croats; *Н₄*, 4: 91, records the year as 991 (6499); *С₁*, 5: 121, gives the date as 993 (6501), as does *Б₁*, 7: 314; and *Т_р*, p. 116. The reference, however, is excluded in *Т*; *ПН*, 9: 65, gives the year as 995 (6503); and *НН* omits any mention of the event. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 166–167 and 505, wherein Likhachev questions the validity of this statement, holding that a thirteenth-century event has been conflated with the tenth.

peace with his neighbors, so too did Vladimir. However, *ПВЛ* for 996 (6504) limits the number of peaceful neighbors to three and relates:⁷²

И БѢ ЖИВА СЪ КНЯЗИ ШКОЛНИИ МИРОМЪ СЪ БОЛЕСЛАВОМЪ ЛАДЬСКИМЪ И СЪ
СТЕФАНОМЪ ОУГРЬСКИМЪ И СЪ ЯНДРЮХОМЪ ЧЕШЬСКИМЪ И БѢ МИРЪ МЕЖУ НИИ
И ЛЮБИ

He lived in peace and love with the neighboring princes—Boleslaw Chrobry [of Poland], [Saint] Stephen of Hungary, and the Czech Udalrich [of Bohemia].

But the Germans (although they are not identified in *ПВЛ*) and the Poles were Latin Christians. Their proselytizing activities must have been disturbing to Vladimir and the Byzantine-rite clergy in Rus'. This factor negated the argument of pacific relations and affected the tranquil links that he supposedly maintained with them. The exclusion of a reference to the Germans appears to be a deliberate omission, perhaps implying that their relationship was indeed strained. Thus the ideal of a pacific prince created by the Rus' scribes may not be wholly accurate, as we shall further observe.

From the outset of his rule, Vladimir's relationship with the Byzantines was strained and often not on peaceful terms, continuing the age-old rivalries over commercial, diplomatic, and other matters between them. *ПВЛ* relates that as a pre-condition for his conversion to Byzantine Christianity Vladimir had anticipated receiving the hand in marriage of the porphyrogenete princess Anna, the daughter of Romanos II and the sister of the reigning emperor Basil II. She would have been about twenty-five years of age in 988 and a few years older than Vladimir.⁷³ But Basil had frustrated

⁷² *ПСРЛ* 1: 126; 2: 111, that slightly emends the text to read: И БѢ ЖИВА СЪ КНЯЗИ ШКОЛНИИ ЕГО МИРОМЪ СЪ БОЛЕСЛАВОМЪ ЛАДЬСКИМЪ И СЪ СТЕФАНОМЪ ОУГРЬСКИМЪ И СЪ ЯНДРОНИКОМЪ ЧЕШЬСКИМЪ И БѢ МИРЪ МЕЖИ НИИ И ЛЮБИ И ЖИВАШЕ ВОЛОДИМИРЪ ВЪ СТРАХѢ БЖИИ with the added phrase: "and Vladimir lived in the fear of God;" *H*, 3: 165; *H*, 4: 95 (textually paralleling *ПВЛ-Н*); *G*, 5: 123; *B*, 7: 316; *PH*, 9: 67, wherein the statement is entered for the year 998 (6506) rather than the common date found in other annals; *T*, 15: 119; *A*, 20/1: 84; *ВЛ*, 30: 39; *НК*, 42: 56; and *Тр*, p. 119. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171 and 506.

⁷³ Ioannis Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, p. 254, places her birth on 13 March 963. Attention should be drawn to the fact that there exists a tenth-century chronological disparity in the Byzantine chronicle computation of years. Some Byzantine chroniclers commence the Creation cycle with the year 5500, unlike the majority of scribes who commence with 5508. Skylitzes, we assume, begins his account with the early ninth century AD. It is unclear then whether for the earlier pre-Christian centuries he would have commenced with 5500 or 5508. If he preferred 5500, and the date of her birth is reconstructed to 13 March 955, then Anna could have been significantly older than Vladimir, perhaps as much as an eight-year or more difference. Also, it is highly improbable that she could have given birth to Boris and Gleb

Vladimir in this effort and even the reluctance of Anna to wed Vladimir complicated matters and became contributing factors, multiplying the difficulties between the Rus' and Byzantines. To improve his diplomatic position and to gain an advantage, in late 988 (6496) Vladimir attacked Korsun' (also given as Kherson, Cherson), an ancient Greek colonial city situated on the Crimean coast that dates its foundation to the fifth century BC.⁷⁴ Upon taking the city, he pressed the Byzantine emperor to abide by their prior agreement concerning baptism and marital union. Recognizing the significance of the loss of Korsun' and the preservation of Byzantine interests in the Crimea, Basil relented and in the Autumn of 989 (6497) the Kievan prince received Anna as his wife, but only on the condition that he first be baptized a Christian. The actual year of baptism remains a contentious issue among scholars, the majority of whom accept the date of 988. This precondition was postulated on the notion that a Christian porphyrogenete princess could not wed a pagan prince, although lesser princesses according to numerous Byzantine sources had been married to non-Christian nobility. Also, the issue of the military opportunist, Bardas Phokas, who two years earlier had fomented a rebellion in Anatolia and perchance had sought to unseat

ca. 1000, when she would have been in her mid- to late-forties, although there is always the outside chance that this was so.

⁷⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 109–111; 2: 94–96; *Н₁*, 3: 150–152; *Н₄*, 4: 80–82; *С₁*, 5: 117–118, but entered for the year 987 (6495); *В₁*, 7: 307–309, wherein the account is entered for 988 (6496); *ПН*, 9: 53–55, stating that Vladimir began the march on Korsun' in 988 (6496) and was baptized there; *Т₁*, 15: 102–104; *А₁*, 20/1: 77–78; and *Л₁*, 30: 34, concur with the information in *ПН*; and *НК*, 42: 51–53, accepting the year of 988 for his baptism. For a variant text on the Korsun' attack and his marriage to Anna, and the blessings this brought upon Kievan Rus', cf. *К₁*, 21/1: 94–95. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 111; and *БЛДП* 1: 154–155 and 504. Jakob relates that Vladimir took the city in the third year after his conversion, in 990, when tradition also claims that he was baptized. On this cf. Golubinsky, 1/1: 158–163 and 224–227. On the Korsun' attack, the dating of the attack, and Vladimir's subsequent marriage to Anna, cf. Leon Diakonos, *Ἱστορία*, pp. 171 ff. (x.10); *The History of Leo the Deacon: Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century*, introduction, trans., and annotations by Alice-Mary Talbot and D.F. Sullivan, DOS 41 (Washington, 2005): 217 f., esp. n. 92; and Michael Psellos, *Chronographia*, ed. E. Renauld, 1 (Paris, 1926): i.1 ff.; and *idem*, *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. The Chronography of Michael Psellus*, trans. E.R.A. Sewter (Harmondsworth, 1953), pp. 4–35. Note also, Golubinsky, 1/1: 246–250; V.D. Grekov, “Повесть’ Временных Леть о походе Владимира на Корсунь,” *ИзвТОИАЕ* 30 (60) (1929): 99–112; M.D. Priselkov, “Русско-Византийское отношения IX–XII,” *ВДИ* 3 (1939): 98–109; Soloviev, *История России*, 1: 183–184; N.M. Bogdanova, “О времени взятия Херсона князем Владимиром,” *ВВ* 47 (1986): 39–46; S.A. Beliaev, “Поход князя Владимира на Корсунь,” *ВВ* 51 (1990): 153–164; A. Porre, “О причинах похода Владимира Святославича на Корсунь, 986–989 гг.,” *Вестник МГУ. Series 8: История*, 2 (1978): 45–58; and *idem*, “Rus' i Byzancjum w Latach 986–989,” *Kwartalnik historyczny* 85/1 (1978): 3–23. Cf. Hanak, “Vladimir I: The New Solomon,” pp. 107, n. 24, for additional sources on the attack.

Basil from the imperial throne, also weighed on the emperor.⁷⁵ Given the difficulty of his position, Basil acquiesced to Vladimir's demand.⁷⁶ Although the marriage alliance at least in theory was intended to improve Rus' relations *vis-à-vis* the Byzantine Empire, a host of new issues and perplexing problems on questions of rulership that shall be addressed in the following chapter emerged soon after the marital ceremony. Vladimir did gain an immediate advantage, but this proved to be an ephemeral victory and an illusory accomplishment at best. Solomon had also advanced the interests of the Hebrew kingdom by marrying the daughter of the Egyptian pharaoh. And as was customary, she received as a dowry from her father the Canaanite fortress of Gezer in the "Promised Land" that the pharaoh had earlier captured from the Hebrews. Following their marriage, Solomon rebuilt the fortification to strengthen his defenses in that region. Vladimir through his marriage to Anna entered the Christian community of nations and momentarily profited from this relationship through peaceful trade and a period of non-belligerence.

In the internal consolidation of his political powers, *ПБД* parallels Vladimir's achievements with the successes of Solomon. From the onset of his rule, Vladimir as his forerunners on the Kievan seat relied upon the loyalty and support of the nobility and retinue to maintain their paramount position. He placed his trusted lieutenants in the major centers. The *Books of Kings* relates that Solomon appointed twelve governors⁷⁷ over all Israel, assuming the historical accuracy that twelve Hebrew tribes then resided on its lands, and they were entrusted to furnish all necessities, essential

⁷⁵ On Bardas Phokas, cf. Leon Diakonos, iii.4. We should notice that the insurrection of Bardas Phokas receives far more attention in Russian histories, unlike Byzantine chronicles that downplay the significance of the revolt. For a comparative illustration of the Russian and Byzantine emphasis or non-emphasis on Bardas Phokas and his insurrection, cf. e.g. A.A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, 1 (Madison, 1952): 310–311, 323, and 347; A. Kazhdan, "Phokas," *ODB* 3 (New York and Oxford, 1991): 1665–1666. The scholarly disputation does not end there. For more recent discussions, cf. A. Poppe, "The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus. Byzantine-Russian Relations between 986–989," *DOP* 30 (1976): 195–244, esp. 240–242; and S. Franklin and J. Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus, 750–1200* (London and New York, 1996), pp. 161–162.

⁷⁶ Vasil'evsky, V.G., *Труды В. Г. Васильевского*, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1908): 196 ff.; and 2 (St. Petersburg, 1909): 62 ff.

⁷⁷ *IKings*, iv. 7–19, which recalls that Solomon appointed Benhur to Mount Ephraim; Bendecar to govern five areas: Macces, Salebin, Bethsames, Elon, and Bethanan; Benhesed to Aruboth; Benabinadab to Nephth-Dor; Bana to administer Thanac, Mageddo, and Bethsan; Bengaber over Ramoth, Galaad, and Argob; Ahindab to Manaim; Achimaas to Nephtali; Baana to Aser and Baloth; Josaphat to Issachor; Semei to Benjamin; and Gaber to Gilead.

sustenance, and military protection for the maintenance of his rule. His appointees were selected from among the leading Hebrew chieftains, their sons, or sons-in-law. Vladimir, soon after his Christianization, altered his scheme of internal administration and abandoned the practice of designating his leading nobles and members of the retinue to govern in the provincial centers. The question must have arisen of their willingness to accept Christianity and to abandon paganism that remained strong among them and a large segment of the provincial populace. Rus' sources admit that a number of nobles and members of the retinue refused conversion and were permitted to emigrate elsewhere. Vladimir, then, unlike Solomon, assigned his twelve sons, many of whom were still quite young, to be governors (*ПОСАДЬНИКИ*) of the main provincial towns. *ПВЛ-Л* recognizes that Vladimir had twelve sons, but lists only eleven (twelve when a textual punctuation is inserted):⁷⁸

⁷⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121. A scribal or textual error that appears in *ПВЛ-Л* occurred during the transmission or publishing of the text. Svjatopolk and Vsevolod are distinct individuals, thus raising the number of cited sons from nine to ten. The passage, though grammatically incorrect, is later rectified, noting that Svjatopolk was assigned to Turov and Vsevolod to Vladimir. *ПВЛ-И*, 2: 105, confuses the listing of sons, citing twelve, but naming eleven as we shall notice and omitting Jaroslav (but unlike 2: 67 that lists him): **ВЫШЕЛАВЪ. ИЗЈАЛАВЪ. СЪТОПОЛКЪ. И ЙРОПОЛКЪ. ВСЕВОЛОДЪ [.] СЪТОСЛАВЪ. МЪСТИСЛАВЪ. БОРИСЪ И ГЛЪБЪ. СТАНИСЛАВЪ. ... ПОЗВИЗДАЪ. СУДИСЛАВЪ**, "Vysheslav, Izjaslav, Svjatopolk, and Jaropolk, Vsevolod[,] Svjatoslav, Mstislav, Boris and Gleb, Stanislav, Pozvizard, [and] Sudislav." Were Jaroslav added, the list would expand to thirteen. Further, Vsevolod and Svjatoslav are distinct persons and this citation may be no more than a scribal error or the publishing omission of a punctuation mark. There appears to be no immediate explanation for the exclusion of Jaroslav in the second rendition of *ПВЛ*, unless there existed a bias against him at that time because of his Scandinavian links and because of his rebellion against his father. Another plausible explanation is that Jaroslav represented a town, Novgorod, that continued to exhibit strong republican features, thus denying the territorial unity of the Kievan state and being antithetical to the notion of a unified principality in the minds of the Rus' annalists. Also, *ПВЛ-И*, makes clear that when Jaroslav was assigned to Novgorod, Boris was named head of Rostov, but this text also adds that Gleb was given Murom. Doubtless, the annals have added events to the 980 entry without considering, for example, that Boris and Gleb were born at least two decades later. The later annals record the following: *Н*₁, 3: 128; and *Тр*, pp. 93–94, to read: **РОГАНЪДЪ ... ОТ НЕЯ ЖЕ РОДНАСЯ ЧЕТЫРЕ СЫНЫ: ИЗЈАЛАВА, МЪСТИСЛАВА, ЙРОСЛАВА, ВСЕВОЛОДА, И ДВЕ ДЩЕРИ; ОТ ГРЪКНИКЪ СЪАТОПОЛКА, А ОТ ДРУГИЯ СЪАТОСЛАВА, МЪСТИСЛАВА, А ОТ БОЛГАРЫНИ БОРИСА И ГЛЪБА ...**, "Rogved ... who gave birth to Izjaslav, Mstislav, Jaroslav, Vsevolod, and two daughters; by a Greek Svjatopolk, and by a Czech Vysheslav, and by others Svjatoslav, [and] Mstislav, and by a Bulgarian Boris and Gleb ..." *Н*₂, 4: 89; *С*₁, 5: 120; and *В*, 7: 313, does not, however, name their mothers but does state that there were twelve sons and lists them in a questionable order: **ВЫШЕЛАВЪ, ИЗЈАЛАВЪ, СЪАТОПОЛКЪ, ЙРОСЛАВЪ, ВСЕВОЛОДЪ, СЪАТОСЛАВЪ, МЪСТИСЛАВЪ, БОРИСЪ, ГЛЪБЪ, СТАНИСЛАВЪ, ПОЗВИЗДАЪ, СУДИСЛАВЪ. НИК** (Zenkovsky), 1: 107; and *ПН*, 9: 57, eliding references to the sons' mothers, but stressing rather their baptism by Metropolitan Michael in the year 989 (6497), name twelve: **ВЫШЕЛАВЪ, ИЗЈАЛАВЪ, СЪАТОПОЛКЪ,**

ВЫШЕСЛАВЪ· ИЗЈАСЛАВЪ· ЯРОСЛАВЪ· СВЯТОПОЛКЪ[·] ВЕСЕЛОДЪ· СВЯТОСЛАВЪ [СВЯТОСЛАВЪ]· МЪСТИСЛАВЪ· БОРИСЪ· ГЛѢБЪ· СТАНИСЛАВЪ· ПОЗВИЗДА· СУДИСЛАВЪ·

Vysheslav, Izjaslav, Jaroslav, Svjatopolk[,] Vsevolod, Svjatoslav, Mstislav, Boris, Gleb, Stanislav, Pozvizd, [and] Sudislav.

The naming of sons, their identification, and assignment to fortified towns is problematic. Also questionable is the order in which they are named. It is unclear whether they are presented in the order of the oldest to the

ЯРОСЛАВЪ, СВЯТОСЛАВЪ, МСТИСЛАВЪ, БОРИСЪ, ГЛѢБЪ, СТАНИСЛАВЪ, ПОЗВИЗДАЪ, СУДИСЛАВЪ. *T*, 15: 73, also emends the list of sons and mothers to read: РОГНѢДЪ... ОТЬ НЕМЖЕ РОДН ЧЕТЫРЕ СЫНЫ: ИЗЈАСЛАВА, ЯРОСЛАВА, МСТИСЛАВА, ВЕСЕЛОДА, И ДВѢ ДЩЕРИ; А ОТЬ ГРЕКНИИ СВЯТОПОЛКА; А ОТЬ ЧЕХУНИ ВЫШЕСЛАВА; А ОТЬ ДРУГА ЧЕХИИ СВЯТОСЛАВА И СТАНИСЛАВА; А ОТЬ ЦАРЕВНЫ ОТЬ ЯННЫ БОРИСА И ГЛѢБА... "Rogned By her were born four sons: Izjaslav, Jaroslav, Mstislav, Vsevolod, and two daughters; and by a Greek Svjatopolk; and by a Czech Vysheslav; and by another Czech Svjatoslav and Stanislav; and by the empress Anna Boris and Gleb" On the other hand, *A*, 20/1: 81, names twelve sons as follows: 1. ВЫШЕСЛАВЪ, 2. ИЗЈАСЛАВЪ, 3. СВЯТОПОЛКЪ, 4. ЯРОСЛАВЪ, 5. ВЕСЕЛОДЪ, 6. СВЯТОСЛАВЪ, 7. МСТИСЛАВЪ, 8. БОРИСЪ, 9. ГЛѢБЪ, 10. СТАНИСЛАВЪ, 11. ПОДВИЗДАЪ, 12. СУДИСЛАВЪ. Further, *A* for the same year 980, rather than 988, assigns them to various towns, including Boris to Rostov and Gleb to Turov that had been respectively given to Jaroslav and Svjatopolk in the latter year. *ВЛ*, 30: 37, cites twelve sons, but lists them as: СВЯТОПОЛКЪ, ЯРОПОЛКЪ, ЯРОСЛАВЪ, ВЕСЕЛОДЪ, СВЯТОСЛАВЪ, ПОЗВѢЗДАЪ, БОРИСЪ И ГЛѢБЪ, МЪСТИСЛАВЪ, СТАНИСЛАВЪ, СУДИСЛАВЪ, ВЫШЕСЛАВЪ. *НН*, 42: 55, also names twelve sons in the following order: ВЫШЕСЛАВЪ, ИЗЈАСЛАВЪ, СВЯТОПОЛКЪ, ЯРОСЛАВЪ, ВЕСЕЛОДАЪ, СВЯТОСЛАВЪ, МСТИСЛАВЪ, БОРИСЪ, ГЛѢБЪ, СТАНИСЛАВЪ, ПОЗВИЗДАЪ, СУДИСЛАВЪ. Also, cf. Tatishchev, 2: 227–228, n. 163, noting that Anna bore a daughter Maria, although Poppe gives her name as Theophana. Cf. A. Poppe, "Theophana von Novgorod," *Bs* 58 (1997): 131–158. We should not discount the possibility that Anna bore two daughters, Maria and Theophana, although the sources are certainly confused and many are even silent on this matter.

A, 20/1: 65, contains a major chronological transposition. The entry under 980 (6488) relates the birth of Boris and Gleb to a Bulgarian mother at least two decades earlier, as we have previously noted, but before the fact. Further regarding Boris and Gleb, the derivation of their names is complicated by the fact that Boris, upon baptism, received the Christian name of Roman (РОМАНЪ) that is derived from the Greek Romanos. The Byzantine emperor Romanos II was the father of Anna. Paradoxically, a Greek Christian name is not provided for Gleb. On this, cf. "Сказание о Борисе и Глебе," in *БЛДР* 1: 330. Raffenberger, p. 100, claims that Gleb was given the Judeo-Christian name of David. Although none of the annals or known literature so state, while the centuries-later menologia appear to have expanded upon the usage of baptismal names and have emended the earlier accounts. There appears to be no clear explanation for this confusing information, aside perhaps the explanation that the scribe(s) exercised literary license. Also, legend claims that Boris and Gleb were "uterine brothers," implying only that they were born of the same mother. The phrase is common to the Classical Greek period, wherein it reads ἀδελφοί μητρώοι. This phrase is not common to the Byzantine era and does not appear in any of its literature. Also, in the Christian era ὁ ἀδελφός came to be associated with a baptized member of the Christian community. Although compound Greek terms appear in the medieval period, neither ἀδελφομητρώος nor the Classical Greek phrase are to be found in the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, eds. E. Trapp, et al., fasc. 1 (Vienna, 1994): 18–19.

youngest, or the scribes simply listed them without consideration of their relative ages, or categorized them through their maternal links. From the annals we can reconstruct to a certain degree, but not conclusively, the following sons born of various mothers who accompanied them to these centers. Among the progeny, by his wife Rogned, the daughter of Rozvold, the Scandinavian head of Polotsk, Vladimir had four sons: Izjaslav, Mstislav,⁷⁹ Vsevolod, and Jaroslav, to whom he awarded respectively the towns of Polotsk, Tmutorokan', Vladimir, and Rostov.⁸⁰ By Jaropolk's wife, the former Greek nun Predslava who had been forced into an illicit relationship with Vladimir after he had arranged the death of her husband, was born Svjatopolk.⁸¹ He and his mother were assigned to Turov.⁸² Vysheslav, the oldest son by a Czech woman,⁸³ was given the administration of Novgorod, but he died a decade after his arrival,⁸⁴ and this second most important town was reassigned to Jaroslav. *ПВЛ* does not name any sons borne of Anna. Both redactions, *ПВЛ-А* and *ПВЛ-Н*, assert that *ѿ Болгарыни Бориса и Глѣба*, "by a Bulgarian Boris and Gleb."⁸⁵ As a consequence, a number of early Rus'

⁷⁹ Vladimir may have had two sons named Mstislav, one by Rogned and another by an unnamed woman whom Tatishchev, 1: 113, identifies as Mal'frid. This is not an uncommon Christian practice that after the death of an infant child bearing a particular designation, the name is reused and then given to a newborn son. Of the cited annals, only *Н*, 3: 128, mentions a second Mstislav, "by another." However, it is the first-cited Mstislav that is of concern to us, for he shared power with his brother Jaroslav after the end of the fratricidal conflicts. Cf. 1: 80; and 2: 67. Also, cf. *RPCLT*, p. 94; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129.

⁸⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121; 2: 105–106; *Н*, 4: 89–90; *С*, 5: 120; *В*, 7: 343; *ПН*, 9: 57; and *НН*, 42: 55. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–165. Tatishchev, 1: 113, adds that Gorislava, that is Rogned, accompanied Izjaslav to Polotsk.

⁸¹ For the ranking of sons from the oldest to the youngest fathered by Vladimir and especially the place of Svjatopolk in this listing, among other issues, cf. Nazarenko, pp. 368 and 382. On the complex question of the offspring of Vladimir, cf. the article of M. Millard, "Sons of Vladimir, Brothers of Iaroslav." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 12 (286–295).

⁸² *ПСРЛ* 1: 78 and 121; 2: 67 and 105; *Н*, 3: 128; *Н*, 4: 56; *С*, 5: 111–112; *В*, 7: 292–293; *ПН*, 9: 39–41; *Т*, 15: 73; and *НН*, 42: 42–43 and 55. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 94 and 119; *БЛДР* 1: 128–129 and 164–165; and Tatishchev, 1: 113.

⁸³ Tatishchev, 1: 113, states that Vysheslav's mother was Olova, a Varangian princess, which may be accurate and would explain his assignment to Novgorod. Cf. *ПСРЛ* 1: 80 and 121; and 2: 67 and 105. Also, *RPCLT*, pp. 94 and 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129 and 164–165.

⁸⁴ *Тр*, p. 121, records the year of his death as 1001.

⁸⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 80; 2: 67; and *supra*, n. 78. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 94; and *БЛДР* 1: 128–129. Even the sixteenth-century *А*, *ПСРЛ* 20/1: 65; and *Х*, 22/1: 366, preserve the tradition that Boris and Gleb were born of a Bulgarian. No annals, however, record the years of their births. Hence, there is no possibility of clearly resolving this question, nor whether Anna or the Bulgarian was their mother. Cf. Ю. Табов, *Когда крестилась Киевская Русь?* Серия «Досье Новой Хронологии» (St. Petersburg, 2003), pp. 222–225; A. Poppe, "Der Kampf um die Kiewer Thronfolge

sources attribute the birth of Boris and Gleb, the two youngest of the twelve sons, not to Anna, but to a Bulgarian woman, perhaps a former nun, and this traditional attribution was maintained in the annals for a number of centuries thereafter. Further, the given names of Boris and Gleb are not common in Greek or in Rus' usage of the tenth and early eleventh centuries, but are of Bulgarian provenance. However, the accuracy of this information furnished in the Rus' sources remains suspect and may be based on inflammatory accounts intended to defame Vladimir and to preserve the belief that he had remained a libertine. Or it may be an admission that he had not remained chaste or faithful to Anna, as the necrological accounts would have us believe. There remains the possibility that in the later Rus' annalistic redactions, the scribes were deliberate in their desire to minimize the Byzantine impact and stressed Rus' developments and their own national heritage. During the succession crisis following the death of Vladimir in 1015, Boris and Gleb were in their early to mid-teens. They were slain by Svjatopolk's Varangian mercenaries.⁸⁶ They could have been as Tatishchev maintains, given their young age, sons born of Anna.⁸⁷ *ПВД* further establishes that Vladimir assigned Boris to govern Rostov⁸⁸ that initially had been awarded to Jaroslav, but Tatishchev also notes that Boris remained with his mother, apparently in Kiev or on one of the nearby

nach dem 15. Juli 1015," *Forschungen zur europäischen Geschichte* 50 (1995): 275–296; and *idem*, "Feofana Novgorodskaia," *Новгородский Исторический Сборник* 6 (1997): 102–120. For a critical analysis of Poppe's identification of Boris and Gleb as the sons of Anna, cf. J. Shepard, "Otto III, Boleslaw Chrobry and the 'Happening' at Gniezno, A.D. 1000: Some Possible Implications for Professor Poppe's Thesis Concerning the Offspring of Anna Porphyrogenita," *Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia* 3: *Byzantium and East Central Europe*, eds. G. Prinzing, M. Salamon, and P. Stephenson (Cracow, 2001): 27 ff.; and repr. in *idem*, *Emergent Elites and Byzantium in the Balkans and East-Central Europe*, Variorum Collected Studies Series 953 (Farnham, 2011), essay X.

⁸⁶ Unlike the Rus' historiographic tradition, Tat'iana N. Dzhakson, *Исландские королевские саги о Восточной Европе (первая треть XI в.): Тексты, перевод, комментарий* (Moscow, 1994), pp. 91–119, identifying non-Rus' sources that assign the death of Boris, not to the treachery of Svjatopolk, but to that of Jaroslav. This is not an original conclusion, but rather it appears in a number of western traditions. On the contradictory source evidence and secondary sources, cf. Nazarenko, pp. 453–455. Also, on the role of Jaroslav in the deaths of Boris and Gleb, cf. Shaikin, pp. 399–429, esp. 411–412, wherein he questions the reconstruction of events and the assertion of responsibility for their deaths. As well, cf. I.N. Danilevsky, *Древняя Русь глазами современников и потомков (IX–XII вв.): Курс лекций* (Moscow, 1998), p. 347; and G.G. Demidenko, *Великий князь Руси Ярослав Мудрый, Научно-популярный очерк* (Kharkov, 2011), pp. 50–69.

⁸⁷ Tatishchev, 1: 113.

⁸⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121; and 2: 105. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–165.

estates. This information is contradictory and the mother could not have been Anna who passed away in 1011. The discrepancies in the sources can be explained in part. The *ПВЛ* entry for 1015 relates of the conferment upon Boris command of an army to wage war upon the Pechenegs, one of the marauding Asiatic hordes in southern Rus', although some of them appear to be unwarlike and to have settled down to a sedentary life in the area, being engaged in agriculture and horse breeding. If Boris had assumed a military command and gained a significant victory over the Pechenegs, this would strengthen his claim to succeed to the princely seat at Kiev since heretofore he had not governed a major Rus' town and its district, nor had he led an army into battle. In essence, given his youth, he was lacking in experience.⁸⁹ Gleb, however, was designated to govern Murom, which seat he appears to have occupied.⁹⁰ Other women bore Vladimir four sons: Svjatoslav who was assigned to Ovruch, Stanislav, Sudislav, and Pozvzd.⁹¹ *С*₁ records the assignment of Sudislav to Pskov,⁹² and *Б* indicates that Stanislav was awarded Smolensk.⁹³ These are indisputable facts based on regional accounts, since we have no other sources that prove the contrary. And, however, no sources mention the assignment of Pozvzd to a specific fortified center, although we should assume that this did occur, based on the assertion in *ПВЛ* that the twelve sons were placed in the main towns.

The redivision of Kievan Rus' into twelve administrative units corresponds to Solomon's governorships. But the designation of Vladimir's sons as urban princes had important consequences for the Kievan state. Unlike Solomon, Vladimir had now associated immediate family members with the main seats of political, military, and economic power, while the Hebrew king relied upon the loyalty of followers of whom he could not always be certain of their faithfulness. But the same can be argued of Vladimir's sons who demonstrated selfish and separatist interests in their respective regions, as

⁸⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121 and 130; and 2: 105 and 115. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 119 and 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–165 and 172–173.

⁹⁰ Tatishchev, 1: 113. He appears to be confusing dates and the sequence of events, leaving the impression that Gleb was given this seat soon after the Christianization of his father Vladimir, that year being perhaps ca. 991. This, obviously, is quite unlikely. Also, he is following *ПВЛ* too closely, which errs in its reading, chronologically transposing individuals from 1000–1015 to 991, a number of whom were not even born in this earlier year.

⁹¹ Академия Наук СССР. Институт истории. Ленинградское отделение. *Устюжский летописный свод. (Архангелогородский летописец)*, ed. K.N. Serbina (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), p. 30. Tatishchev, 1: 113, relates that Mal'fred was the mother of Svjatoslav.

⁹² *ПСРЛ* 5: 120.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 7: 313. Cf. Tatishchev, 1: 113.

later the revolt of 1015 would make clear. Yet the creation of consanguineous governorships throughout the Kievan state laid the foundation for subsequent dynastic territorial disputes and the disruption of peaceful unified rule, although in theory these divisions were intended to strengthen the personal and unified state powers of the prince at Kiev. Grekov and Paszkiewicz interpret Vladimir's assignment of towns as a demonstration of his personal political strength. He could, at will, move his sons about.⁹⁴ Yet clearly, as Presniakov stresses,⁹⁵ political considerations and relations between father and son played a major role in the distribution of his sons among the various towns. Thus Jaroslav, though perhaps the fourth or fifth eldest of Vladimir's extensive progeny and a favorite of his mother Rogned, was rewarded with Novgorod, the second most important Kievan settlement and a rival of the mother town, Kiev. Its proximity to Scandinavia demonstrates its importance as the leading commercial center in northern Rus'. And by 991, it is plausible that a Scandinavian marriage had been contracted for Jaroslav, further enhancing the significance of his placement at this northern center.⁹⁶

Although the structure of their economies differed, the Hebrew and Rus' states engaged extensively in their respective commercial activities. Both Solomon and Vladimir imported and exported goods, the former on a lavish and the latter on a lesser scale. Unlike Vladimir, Solomon maintained

⁹⁴ Grekov, *Киевская Русь*, p. 477; and Paszkiewicz, *Origin*, pp. 160–161 and 456.

⁹⁵ Presniakov, *Княжеское право*, p. 40. As Franklin, "Kievan Rus'," 1: 75, clearly demonstrates: "On Vladimir's death this structure collapsed." Further, following the fratricidal conflicts among Vladimir's extensive progeny, Franklin, *ibid.*, p. 77, claims that "before the final resolution when just one of Vladimir's sons—Iaroslav [*sic*]—was left alive" The sources are not specific on this point. We cannot assume on the basis of the silence of the annals that this was so.

⁹⁶ Snorri Sturluson, *Heimskringla or the Lives of the Norse Kings*, ed. E. MONSEN and trans. A.H. SMITH (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 302–305; *idem*, *Heimskringla: History of the Kings of Norway*, trans. L.M. HOLLANDER (Austin, 1964; repr. 1991), pp. 340 and 342–343. For an analysis of the text, cf. A.N. GUREVICH, *История и saga* (Moscow, 1972). Hereafter, the Monsen edition will be cited, unless noted otherwise. Cf. Tatishchev, 1: 215–216; and S.H. CROSS, "La tradition islandaise de Saint Vladimir," *RES* 11 (1931): 13–135, who stresses the relationship of the Riurikid and Scandinavian houses in marital and diplomatic affairs with Kievan Rus'. The topic of Scandinavian-Rus' relations and its literature, and especially the establishment of Varangian outposts in Kivan Rus' proper, is further studied by Elena A. RYDZEVSKAIA, *Древняя Русь и Скандинавия в IX–XIV вв. (девятом-четырнадцатом веках): Материалы и исследования* (Moscow, 1978), esp. pp. 143 ff. Nazarenko, pp. 282–283, 490–491, and *passim*, raises the question of whether an Anna may have been the first wife of Jaroslav, although the evidence for this statement is skimpy and remains at best speculative. It cannot be corroborated in the primary sources. It is plausible that, if so, then this was a brief marriage.

a monopoly on foreign commerce. His main item of trade was horses.⁹⁷ Further, he maintained a large fleet of seagoing vessels that traded in the eastern Mediterranean.⁹⁸ Perhaps for the first time in Hebrew history, Israel had been introduced to and expanded into the mainstream of oriental commerce and civilization. Notably, Jerusalem emerged as a city of wealth and luxury during Solomon's reign.

The commercial issues for Vladimir, however, differed from those of the Hebrew king. Commerce, mainly the export of raw materials, was in a transitional stage. The major trade routes that transited southern Rus' were shifting westward toward the Red cities, given the need for safer passage. Kiev by then had entered an early phase of commercial decline. The Pechenegs remained a major nemesis, disrupting commercial traffic on the Dnieper and to the east. Further, they were frequently at odds with the Kievan prince over various and sundry issues.⁹⁹ They operated as a marauding group and did so almost with impunity throughout southeastern Rus'. But in spite of the unbridled efforts of the Pechenegs, the Rus' under Vladimir continued to import from Byzantium major products, among them wines, silk fabrics, objects of art as icons and jewelry, fruits, and glassware. In turn the Kievans exported wax, honey, furs, grain, and other raw materials. This mutual trade with the Byzantines was an important source of revenue, although the Pechenegs commercial disruptions continued to undermine the financial and economic stability of Vladimir's principality. But in his time, the Kievans were not limited only to trade with Byzantium. They conducted significant and rewarding commerce with Scandinavia and Western and Central Europe. Such activity compensated to some degree for material losses and decreased earnings in the Byzantine trade. The apparent powerlessness of the Kievan prince to contain the Pechenegs and to guarantee safe passage for commerce to the south posed delicate difficulties for the early Rus annalists, who were reluctant to express clearly the consequences for the Kievan state. Rather than focus upon the material aspects of this issue, for their attention obviously was upon the spiritual and the propagation of the Christian faith, they mitigated the effectiveness of this aspect of Vladimir's rule and major gaps appear in the narrative of *ПВЛ* and other accounts for the years from 998 to 1012. *ПН* somewhat addresses these lacunae and enters for the year 1004 (6512) notice of Vladimir's assault upon the Pechenegs who

⁹⁷ *IKings* x. 27–29.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, x. 22.

⁹⁹ V.A. Parkhomenko, "Русь и Печенеги," *С 8* (1929): 138–144, esp. 141.

had threatened Belgorod and adds information on Metropolitan Leontos. This annal further elaborates that Metropolitan Ioan in the year 1008 (6516) raised a stone church in Kiev.¹⁰⁰

To contrast further their like accomplishments, both Solomon and Vladimir are recognized as major builders of elaborate structures. The Old Testament provides an extensive and disproportionate discussion of Solomon's construction and dedication of the Temple that had required thirteen years to build.¹⁰¹ This overshadows the more modest accomplishment of Vladimir and his erection of the Church of the Blessed Virgin of the Tithe (*ДЕВЯТИННА*) that required only seven or eight years to build by artisans (masters) imported from Byzantium.¹⁰² Each of these structures was erected as an extension to the ruler's palace, thus placing Judaism and Christianity in prominent state roles and guiding forces for their rulers and subjects. Neither the Old Testament nor Rus' annals seek to minimize the eminent role of religion in the conduct of state affairs. Further, these texts elaborate upon Solomon's and Vladimir's construction of other edifices and numerous fortified cities and towns, although many purported urban centers were little more than fortified outposts and were at an early stage in their evolution toward becoming prominent political, religious, military, and commercial clusters. While the Hebrew king utilized his newly constructed structures as barracks, arsenals, and storehouses,¹⁰³ *ПВА* elaborates how the Kievan prince established in 991 (6499) the town of Belgorod (also given as Bel'), a vital fortification for deterring Pecheneg assaults upon Kiev and offering a modicum of relief to its residents. Belgorod, however, was established upon the site of an existing village that predated the rule of Vladimir.¹⁰⁴ Vladimir,

¹⁰⁰ *ПСРЛ* 9: 68–69.

¹⁰¹ *IKings* vi–vii. 13–15, and viii; also *IIChronicles* ii. 1–vii. 10.

¹⁰² *ПСРЛ* 1: 121 and 124; and 2: 106 and 108–109. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 119–120; and *БЛДР*, 1: 166–169. The latter makes no entries for 989 and 994, and gives the years respectively as 991 and 996, while *ПВА–А* records the years as 989 and 996, but *ПВА–И* like *БЛДР* cites the years as 991 and 996, so also *Н₁*, *ПСРЛ* 3: 165; *С₁*, 5: 121–122; and *В₁*, 7: 313 and 315. On the other hand, the dates differ in *Н₄*, 4: 91 and 93, giving the years as 990 and 996; *ПН*, 9: 65–66, recording them as 993 and 998; *Т*, 15: 114–115 and 117–118, as 988, 991, and 996; and *НК*, 42: 55–56, as 990 and 996. *Х*, 22/1: 367, fixes the year of construction of the Church of the Blessed Virgin as 991 (6499). For a textual evaluation of the redactions of the *Уставъ князя Владимира* that establishes financial support for the church, cf. Ia. N. Shchapov, *Древнерусские княжеские уставы XI–XV вв.* (Moscow, 1976), pp. 13–84.

¹⁰³ *IKings* vii. 1–12.

¹⁰⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 122; so also *Н₄*, 4: 91; and *НК*, 42: 55. However, 2: 106, for 992 relates: *ВОЛОДИМИРЪ ЗАЛОЖИ ГРАДЪ БѢЛЪ*, “Vladimir established the town of Bel’ [that is, Belgorod],” *Н₁*, 3: 165, also

in addition to his building efforts at Belgorod, had two or three years earlier erected border fortifications on the Desna, Oster, Trubezh, Sula, and Stugna Rivers in order to ward off the repeated incursions of the Pechenegs.¹⁰⁵

Vladimir's emphasis upon the construction of fortified centers, churches, and frontier fortifications and his focus upon external threats, albeit an indisputable issue for the Kievan prince and his principality, appear to have contributed to internal unrest. He could not satisfy both the demands of internal and external needs, for he lacked sufficient financial and material resources and manpower to address these disruptions that recurred at the urban and provincial levels. Solomon's lavish expenditures upon the Temple and the defenses of his kingdom, on the other hand, led to the separation of his northern territories and the award of these lands to the Phoenician king Hiram as compensation for services that he had rendered to the Hebrews.¹⁰⁶ Solomon in that manner placated the Phoenician king and in doing so introduced political disorder in his kingdom. Although the books of the Old Testament address this matter, they mitigate the factors that led to unrest. Conversely, Vladimir's preoccupation with defenses in the south to thwart Pecheneg incursions necessitated in 997¹⁰⁷ that he recruit upland Varangian and Novgorodian troops to supplement his insufficient forces in the Kievan region. The recurring need to recruit northern forces was a major factor that precipitated Jaroslav's rebellion in 1014¹⁰⁸ and Rus' sources are aware of the consequences of Vladimir's actions. They do not attempt to disguise them or to downplay the negative results of the Kievan prince's deeds. Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor correctly note that "prior to Vladimir's day, the authority of the Kievan princes had been purely patriarchal, but with the delegation of authority over outlying areas [to his sons], centrifugal tendencies soon developed of which Yaroslav's [*sic*] insubordination is the first conspicuous example."¹⁰⁹ Like the Old Testament and its reactions to Solomon's ill-advised foreign alliances, *ПВЛ* rhetorically softens the significance of this

for 992, but cites the name of the town as Belgorod; as well as *G*, 5: 121; *Б*, 7: 314; and *T*, 15: 115. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 166–167, that gives the year as 992, rather than 991.

¹⁰⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121; 2: 106; *H*, 3: 159; *H*, 4: 90; *C*, 5: 120; *Б*, 7: 313; *ПН*, 9: 58; *T*, 15: 113; *ВЛ*, 30: 47; and *НН*, 42: 55. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–165.

¹⁰⁶ *IKings* v. 1–12, and ix. 12–14.

¹⁰⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; and 2: 112. *ПН*, 9: 6, records the year as 998 (6506). Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

¹⁰⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 130, and 2: 114–115. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; *БЛДР* 1: 172–173; and Soloviev, *История России*, 1: 200 and 202.

¹⁰⁹ *RPCLT*, p. 151.

armed resistance and provides a clue to why major textual gaps exist for the years 998 to 1012. The confrontation between father and son came to an unfortunate conclusion in 1015 when Vladimir, aged and ill, set out on a military march against Jaroslav, but en route passed away.

Almost simultaneously there appeared a second source of disagreement during that quiescent period. The dispute emanated within the ranks of high-church ecclesiastics, the majority of whom were Greek born and non-native Rus' at this nascent stage in the Christianization of the principality. Vladimir had demonstrated weakness in resolving domestic problems, often exhibiting a hesitancy to address internal issues. In 996, the bishops brought to the prince's attention that the number of bandits had increased throughout the Kievan state. He was criticized for not seizing and punishing them. Whether these bandits were men of both Varangian and Slavic stock, whom he had previously hired for martial needs, but now he was unable to recompense them for their earlier services or continued service, remains a topic for further study. But his explanation for not punishing them was his genuine "fear of sin (*βοιαλα γρηχα*, literally, 'I fear sin'),"¹¹⁰ that is the sin which such punishment would bring upon him and then how this stain of sin would not be removed, but would damn him to the eternal fires of Hell. There was a commonplace belief among men during the early Christian era, especially among those who held high civil and military posts, who had sought to be Christianized, but delayed baptism until the late stages of their lives for fear of sinning and its consequences. Thus Vladimir showed a reluctance to administer punishment, but he may have also evaded the issue with the statement of fearing sinning because he might have need for their further services in his conquests and struggles against his enemies. He had resigned himself to ignore their banditry to maintain themselves and perhaps even to improve their personal fortunes. The bishops may have personally suffered at the hands of this banditry and this provides an explanation of why they reproved the prince with the counsel that¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ *PCPI* 1: 127; 2: 111 (*βοιαλα γρηχα*); *H*₁, 3: 167; *H*₄, 4: 95; *G*₁, 5: 123; *B*, 7: 316; *T*, 15: 119; *HK*, 42: 56; and *T*_θ, p. 119. The response differs in *PH*, 9: 67, and reads: *βοιαλα Γοβνοδα Βογα*, "I fear the Lord God." Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *BLDP* 1: 170–171. For an interpretation of the significance, and its parallelisms and ambiguities in the context of its usage, cf. Shaikin, p. 120 and n. 585.

¹¹¹ *PCPI* 1: 127; *H*₄, 4: 95; *G*₁, 5: 123; *A*, 20/1: 84–85; *HK*, 42: 56; and *T*_θ, p. 119. *PCPI* 2: 111, with a slight variation in word order and terminological usage; so also *H*₁, 3: 167; *B*, 7: 316; *T*, 15: 119 (but for the year 997 [6505]); and *BA*, 30: 39. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *BLDP* 1: 170–171. Also, Shaikin, p. 120 and n. 586.

... ТЫ ПОСТАВЛЕНЪ ЕСИ ѿ Бѣ на казнь злымъ а добрымъ на милость
догонѣти ти казнити разбойника но со испытомъ

... you are the elect of God for the chastisement of evil and the granting of mercy to the good. It is fitting that you should punish robbers, but after trial.

Their counsel concludes with the added admonition in *ПВЛ-А* that due process of the law should be administered по устройенью отьню и дѣдню, “according to the prescriptions of his father and grandfather.”¹¹² The reproach is an assertion that Vladimir’s princely authority was exclusive, in that he was the elect of God with indivisible powers, but in the same breath the high churchmen acknowledge customary law by invoking the practice of his father and grandfather. And once Vladimir has succeeded to power, the Christian ecclesiastics recognized that the Varangians and Slavs had no customary precedent for the removal of an unfit ruler, aside from assassination or sacrifice as atonement to their pagan deities, because his authority was now conferred upon him directly by God or at least so the churchmen argued. The goal of the latter was to institute rhythm and order in princely rule. And through harmonious collaboration with the prince they would achieve a firm civilizing bond, preserving the unity of the Kievan state and admitting that the rule of his predecessors upon the Kievan seat was sufficient guidance and testimony to his power to arrange for the disposition of robbers.

Solomon, according to his religious characterization, was a devoted worshipper of Yahweh, who minimized the role of other Hebrew deities. He was, however, unlike his father David, who was more impassioned in his religious zeal. The abridged tribute in *ПВЛ*,¹¹³ Jakob’s *A Eulogy and Praise*,¹¹⁴ and the anonymous *Житіе блаженнаго Володимера* (*The Life of the Blessed*

¹¹² *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; *Н*, 4: 95; *С*, 5: 123; *В*, 7: 316; *Т*, 15: 119; *А*, 20/1: 85; *НВ*, 42: 56; and *Тр*, p. 120. We encounter a slight textual variation in *ПВЛ-И*, *ПСРЛ* 2: 112, that reads: по устройенью дѣдню и отьню; *Н*, 3: 167, reading: по устройенью божию и дѣдню и отьню, “according to God’s prescriptions and [those of his] grandfather and father;” however, *ПН*, 9: 67, reinterpolates the passage to read: да творю тако, якоже учитъ отецъ нашъ и ваша святость наказуетъ по божественному закону, “I shall do thus as our father teaches and your holiness chastises according to God’s law.” For a variant textual translation, cf. *Ник* (Zenkovsky), 1: 116–117, wherein the bishops advise Vladimir to punish the robbers according to “divine law,” not customary Varangian-Slavic practices. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

¹¹³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 130–131; 2: 115–118 (slightly expanded text); *Н*, 3: 169 (a very brief eulogistic notice); *Н*, 4: 98–99; *С*, 5: 124–125; *В*, 7: 317–318; *ПН*, 9: 69–70; *Т*, 15: 122–123; *НВ*, 42: 57–58; and *Тр*, p. 122. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 124–126; and *БЛДР* 1: 174–175 and 506, for the biblical citations.

¹¹⁴ Cf. *supra*, n. 6. For the *Life*, cf. *infra*, n. 115, and the citation for Zimin.

Vladimir)¹¹⁵ place importance on the notion that the Kievan prince following his baptism lived and died in the Orthodox faith. While Solomon, in order to appease his foreign wives, allowed the construction of altars to foreign deities,¹¹⁶ Vladimir divorced himself from his pagan past and a multiplicity of wives, placing each of them with their favorite son, more often the oldest, with whom they were unrestricted to live out their lives according to their own preferences and customs.¹¹⁷ *ПВЛ* and the Christian scribes of the later annals remain silent about his former wives, apparently having no interest in their subsequent fortunes or misfortunes. It is probable that, while many of the former wives may have remained pagan, the sons were baptized. But to what degree each son faithfully practiced Christianity remains a debatable topic and in many instances irresolvable for a lack of textual information. In the literature of their respective periods, neither Solomon nor Vladimir is labeled a religious apostate. The texts appear to admit that political necessity determined the actions that each ruler took upon himself to address the ensuing problems. The *Books of Kings* acclaimed Solomon as a pious benefactor of the Hebrew faith with stress upon his construction of the Temple and provision for its ceremonial. In his obituary notice the *Books* furnish no glowing testimonial to his rule.¹¹⁸ Rather, they observe that Solomon's support of foreign deities introduced religious syncretism and they record that he did not fully emulate his father David in following in the path of Yahweh,¹¹⁹ because he had participated in the rites of foreign altars.¹²⁰ Vladimir is free of this censure and we find no reference

¹¹⁵ Makarii, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1: 264–268; Golubinsky, 1/1: 224–238; Nikol'sky, *Материалы*, pp. 16–36; and N. Serebriansky, *Древне-русскія княжескія житія. (Обзоръ редакцій и тексты)*, 2 (Moscow, 1915): 14–26. Cf. Makarii, *Исторія Христіанства въ Россіи до равноапостольнаго Князя Владимира, какъ въвѣденіе въ исторію русской церкви* (2nd rev. ed., St. Petersburg, 1868), pp. 268 ff.; and A.A. Zimin, "Памят и похвала Иакова мниха и Житіе князя Владимира по девнейшем списку," *Краткіе сообщенія Института славяновѣденія* 37 (1963): 66–75. An English translation for the Zimin rendition appears in *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, trans. and introduction by P. Hollingsworth, Harvard Library of Ukrainian Literature 2 (Cambridge, MA, 1992): 165–181.

¹¹⁶ *IKings* xi. 3–6.

¹¹⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121; 2: 105; *Н₁*, 3: 159; *Н₂*, 4: 89–90, makes no reference to the disposition of wives, rather only sons; so also *С₁*, 5: 120; and *Т₁*, pp. 93–94. *В₁*, *ПСРЛ* 7: 313, does refer to a few wives being assigned with their sons to various towns; while *А*, 20/1: 65, notes only several of them. We should observe lack of full citation in *ПН*, 9: 57; as well as *Т*, 15: 113; however, all reference to wives and sons is excised from *НН*, 42: 56. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–165.

¹¹⁸ *IKings* xi. 43.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, xi. 6.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, xi. 4.

to idolatry in any of his necrological accounts, or in the annals. The literary accounts stress that while Solomon in his later years continued to live in sin, Vladimir through baptism repented and distinguished himself through personal penance, almsgiving, and philanthropic activities.¹²¹ Early Rus' writers marvel at the benefits without enumerating them that Vladimir conferred upon the Kievan principality. There is an inference in the *ПВЛ* eulogy that he is less then honored for his conversion of Rus', perhaps because the last two decades of his rule were not especially to be held in high regard.¹²² The texts do not relate significant accomplishments or detail notable failures for this phase of his rule.

ПВЛ and the *Life of the Blessed Vladimir*¹²³ then attempt rather unconvincingly to depart from the historiographic tradition established for Vladimir's rule and the contrast with Solomon. Vladimir is now likened to the Byzantine emperor Constantine I the Great who in the early fourth century AD founded his imperial capital of Constantinople (the City of Constantine) and was the first *basileus* (*βασιλεύς*), that is king of the East Roman Empire.¹²⁴ The Rus' scribes write:¹²⁵

¹²¹ Cf. *ПСРЛ* 1: 131; 2: 116; with some emendation, *Н₁*, 3: 169; *Н₄*, 4: 98–99; *С₁*, 5: 124–125; *В₁*, 7: 317–318; *ПН*, 9: 69–70, with the added observation: *Того же лѣта быша знаменїа страшна на небесѣхъ*, “In that very year there was a frightful sign in the Heavens;” *Т*, 15: 122–123; and *НН*, 42: 57–58. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 174–177.

¹²² *ПСРЛ* 1: 131; and 2: 116. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 125; and *БЛДР* 1: 174–177.

¹²³ Most recently, cf. “July 15. Memorial and Encomium for Prince Volodimer of Rus'. How Volodimer Was Baptized, and [How He] Baptized His Children and All of the Land of Rus' from One End to the Other, and How Volodimer's Grandmother Ol'ga Was Baptized Prior to Volodimer. Written by the Monk Iakov,” in Hollingsworth, esp. pp. 165–181, and nn. 438 and 497.

¹²⁴ On this title, cf. M. McCormick and A. Kazhdan, “Basileus,” in *ODB* 1: 162. Further, Shaikin, p. 124.

¹²⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 130–131; 2: 115; *Н₁*, 3: 169; *Н₄*, 4: 98; *С₁*, 5: 124; *В₁*, 7: 317; *ПН*, 9: 69; *ВЛ*, 30: 41; and *Т_р*, p. 122. *Т*, 15: 122, emends the statement to read: ... и вложиша его въ гробъ мраморный, и съхраниша тѣло его съ плачемъ блаженнаго великаго князя Владимира, новаго Константина великаго рима, иже крестился самъ и люди своа крести: тако и ѿ сътвори подобно ему, “... and they placed him in a marble tomb, and with tears they preserved his body, the blessed grand prince Vladimir, the new Constantine of great Rome, who baptized himself and baptized his people; and so he did like him;” *НН* (Zenkovsky), 1: 121; and *НН*, *PSRL* 42: 57. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 174–175. *А*, *ПСРЛ* 20/1, lacks this comparative analogy. Butler, pp. 44–45, n. 62, questions my minimalization of the Constantine image for Vladimir. I stand by my original interpretation in my doctoral dissertation, “The Nature and the Image of Princely Power in Kievan Russia: 980–1054,” Indiana University, Bloomington, 1973, with the additional evidence presented and discussed in this paragraph. None of the Rus' sources attempt either to contrast or to elaborate extensively upon the similarities of their periods of governance, and only draw this unconvincing parallel. F. von Lilienfeld, “Alt kirchliche und mittelalterliche Missionstradition und motiv in den Berichten der ‘Nestorchronik’ über der

Есть новын Ко[н]стантина великого Рима. же крѣтивъса ѿ и людн своимъ.
 тако и съ створи подобно юму.

He [Vladimir] is the new Constantine of great Rome, who baptized himself and his people, and thus he [Vladimir] did as him.

If Vladimir had followed the example of Constantine, the annals furnish no additional proof to reveal similarities in their achievements during their respective periods of governance, nor do the early Rus' writers seek to establish fully a new historiographic tradition. This contrast emerges in the annals as an isolated statement, perhaps little more than an imaginative comparison of a scribe. Only the anonymous author of the *Life of the Blessed Vladimir* prefaces the previous quote with the following addition: И бысть вторын Константин в русскон земли Володимер, "And Vladimir was the second Constantine in the Rus' land."¹²⁶ He, Anonymous, then concludes:¹²⁷

О, святни царни, Константине и Володимере! Помаганта на противнама ерод-
 никомъ ваю и людн избаванта отъ всякыма беду, греческыма и рускыма, и о
 мнѣ грешнемъ помолнатеа въ Богу, яко имущте дерзновеение к Спасу, да
 спасуеа ваю молнтвами.

Oh, blessed tsars Constantine and Vladimir, help against your contrary relations and deliver your people from every misfortune, Greek and Rus', and for me a sinner, pray to God. As you have spoken freely to the Savior, so I will be saved through your prayers.

The anonymous scribe has taken literary license to alter historical facts and to elevate Vladimir to a most noble rank, that of *tsar*, literally Caesar, and not that of emperor that is in currency in modern historical literature. The scribe has as well made Vladimir the equal of Constantine the Great. Not unlike several medieval German chronicles, *K* makes the extreme attribution, though lacking historical credibility, claiming that Vladimir was a kinsman of the Roman emperor Augustus, whom the source labels a *Caesar* and not *Imperator* from which emperor is a derivative. Like Anonymous, *K* asserts that Vladimir had inherited the title, but not from Constantine the Great, but rather from Augustus, and gives the linkage greater historical

Taufe Vladimir I. Heiligen," in *Slavistische Studie zum X. internationalen Slavistenkongress in Sofia, 1988*, eds. R. Olesch and H. Rothe, SF 54 (Cologne, 1988): 399–414, esp. 413–414, concurs with my interpretation. Also, Shaikin, p. 122, does not attribute great significance to this analogy and passes over it without much, if any, comment.

¹²⁶ Makarii, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1: 267; and Golubinsky, 1/1: 236. Cf. F. Dvornik, "Byzantine Political Ideas in Kievan Russia," *DOP* 9 and 10 (1956): 104.

¹²⁷ Makarii, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1: 268; and Golubinsky, 1/1: 237.

significance and precedence. In addition, Vladimir emerges as an “autocrat (*САМОДЕРЖЕЦЬ*)” who possessed “sovereignty (*ВЛАДЫЧЕСТВО*),” making suitable to “have this quality of Caesar (... *ЦАРСКО ЗВАНІЕ ИМѢЯ*).” The acclaim in *K* concludes with the assertion that Vladimir was *сѣн пренемннѣиѣ самодержавный царь и великий князь*, “this preeminent autocratic *tsar* and grand prince.”¹²⁸ *K* admits no contradiction in this dual usage of Caesar and grand prince, although both titles are differing noble ranks. However, the literature of the medieval era preserves numerous examples of such scribal confusion and the writers of that age are comfortable not to seek further clarification or to provide further explanatory materials. But it is in the religious context that Vladimir is elevated to the rank of *tsar* and is now the equal of Constantine. It is apparent that each ruler had introduced Christianity into his respective state as a favored if not official religion, but the Rus’ scribe has made no claim that each enjoyed priestly powers. Nor unlike Constantine, who often appears in Byzantine artwork dressed in a diaconal robe, hence signifying that he is “a servant of God,” Vladimir is not so portrayed in Rus’ iconography and related art works. One additional point should be noted. Anonymous appears to be writing at an age when relations between Constantinople and Kiev were neither cordial nor pacific. He appears to be aware of the misfortunes that have beset the Greeks and Rus’, but he does not elaborate on what these contrary issues were between them and the consequences of their disagreements.

The annals relate with unusual clarity the death of Vladimir in 1015 and how this event ushered in a prolonged succession crisis,¹²⁹ but curiously the ideological merits of this issue do not appear to be especially disturbing for the early Rus’ writers. *ПЛ* and other accounts convey the impression that it was not essential for the eldest son to succeed to the father’s seat as head of the principality, but they appear to favor the succession of the best qualified, whoever that might be and however that might be determined. This notion appears to be contrary to the established succession practices among the Rurikid family. To justify this alteration of the succession process, the scribes of *ПЛ* and other works find justification for their position in the Old Testament where according to Hebrew tradition there existed no customary regulation that the eldest son was the legitimate heir. Rather, the notion is

¹²⁸ *ПСРЛ* 21/1: 60.

¹²⁹ For the complicated aspects of this succession issue and fratricidal conflict, cf. J. Shepard, “Byzantium and Russia in the Eleventh Century: A Study in Political and Ecclesiastical Relations,” unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oxford University, 1973, ch. 2.

conveyed that a king might nominate any of his sons to take his place. Thus Solomon, perhaps the fifth eldest among the sons, had not been regarded as the one most likely to follow after his father David. But if sovereignty over a unified people was to be preserved, although this may not have been a characteristic of David's rule, Solomon and Vladimir were expected to preserve this feature. Also, the compilers of *ПРЛ* appear to have abandoned the principle of primogeniture in favor of the maintenance of the Old Testament historiographic tradition concerning succession. A contemporary of Vladimir, Thietmar of Merseburg, recalls that the Kievan prince bequeathed the right of succession to two sons.¹³⁰ Historians have generally concluded that evidence points to Vladimir's selection of his two youngest sons, Boris and Gleb, though they remain unnamed in the sources, to sit as co-rulers of the Kievan state.¹³¹ Vladimir, after he had taken ill,¹³² had prepared Boris for the succession when he had the youth at his bedside and gave him command of an army to put down the Pechenegs.¹³³ We should recognize, however, that from Vladimir's viewpoint this was a valid process. Their lineage, assuming that they descended from the imperial Byzantine family and were the sons of Anna, may have favored them, although as we have observed the early Rus' annals attribute their birth to a Bulgarian. But the young boys were, according to some later historical traditions, the progeny of the Byzantine princess Anna, who brought with her an imperial bloodline, and their father then could not have overlooked this important factor. None of Vladimir's other sons could make a similar claim to an imperial pedigree.

The Kievan succession question is further complicated by the multiplicity of Vladimir's customary and non-marital spouses and their numerous offspring. Vysheslav, his firstborn, would have had a rightful claim to the Kievan seat, at least according to the laws of primogeniture, had he continued to live. It is noteworthy that throughout much of Europe in that period, primogeniture was emerging as the acceptable standard for orderly succession. But after Vysheslav, the issue becomes thornier. In 978 when Vladimir took Kiev, among the spoils of war was the forcible seduction of

¹³⁰ Thietmar, *Chronici libri VIII*, ed. F. Kurze (Hanover, 1889), VII. 73. For other sources, primary and secondary, on this question, cf. Franklin and Shepard, pp. 184–185, and nn. 3–8.

¹³¹ Cf. V.T. Pashuto, *Внешняя политика Древней Руси* (Moscow, 1968), p. 36.

¹³² *ПСРЛ* 1: 130; and 2: 115. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 172–173.

¹³³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 130; 2: 115; *Н₁*, 3: 168; *Н₄*, 4: 98; *С₁*, 5: 124; *Б*, 7: 317; *ПН*, 9: 69; *Т*, 15: 121; and *НН*, 42: 57. *А*, 20/1: 86; and *БЛ*, 30: 40, do not state that Boris was with his father at the time, but only that Boris was given command of a military force to deal with the Pechenegs. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 172–173.

Jaropolk's wife. Vladimir's customary arrangement with Rogned followed in 980 and it is plausible that Svjatopolk's birth predated the parturition of his half-brother Izjaslav. If this is true, then this substantiates to some degree Svjatopolk's claim to his birthright, the Kievan seat, for he would have been the second in line. There exists a paradox in the early Rus' sources. No claim to succession is presented for Izjaslav's heritage and there appears no straightforward explanation for his exclusion. The early Rus' sources sidestep this question and provide no insight into why Izjaslav was not a contender for the Kievan seat, unless he did so of his own volition for varied personal reasons or other factors had come into play that excluded him from seeking the Kievan seat.

But the very conception of Svjatopolk became an argument for denying to him the right of succession. *ПВЛ* relates:¹³⁴

ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ЖЕ ЗАЛЕЖЕ ЖЕНУ БРАТЬНЮ· ГРЕКНИЮ· И БѢ НЕПРАЗДАНА· ѿ НЕМЖЕ РОДЕНА СЪТЪПОЛКЪ· ѿ ГРѢХОВНАГО БО КОРЕНИ ЗЛА· ПЛОДЪ БЫВАЕТЬ· ПОНЕЖЕ БѢ БЫЛА МТІІ ЕГО ЧЕРНИЦЮ· А ВТОРОЕ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ЗАЛЕЖЕ Ю· НЕ ПО БРАКУ ПРЕЛЮБОДѢИ БѢ ОУБО· ТѢМЪ И ѿЩЕ ЕГО НЕ ЛЮБАШЕ· БѢ БО ѿ ДВОЮ ѿЩЮ·

Vladimir took to bed the Greek wife of his brother, and she was burdened [with child]. From her Svjatopolk was born. From a sinful root grows evil fruit, for his mother had been a nun and secondly Vladimir had intercourse with her not in marriage, rather it was adultery, and for this his father did not love him, for he was of two fathers.

The annalists, however, do not consistently apply to an offspring the attribution of legitimacy or the disqualification of illegitimacy. The conception of Vladimir was out of wedlock, the product of an illicit affair that his father Svjatoslav had had with Malusha, the stewardess (*ключница*) of Vladimir's grandmother Olga.¹³⁵ On the other hand, Svjatopolk's questionable birth, born of two fathers even if it is highly improbable and physiologically impossible for the conception of one child, remained a perplexing problem for Rus' annalists, although it was a convenient argument for his condemnation. While Vladimir effaced his sins through baptism, the stain of Svjatopolk's lineage from a former nun and incredibly two fathers remained a blot upon

¹³⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 78; 2: 66; reference to the event, the parturition of Svjatopolk, is excised from *T*, 15: 73; but cited in *H*, 3: 127; *H*, 4: 55; *G*, 5: 112; *B*, 7: 293; *ПН*, 9: 40; *A*, 20/1: 65; *ВЛ*, 30: 24; *НК*, 42: 42; and *Tр*, p. 93. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 93; and *БЛДР* 1: 126–127. Also, Shaikin, pp. 142–143.

¹³⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 69; 2: 57; *H*, 3: 121; *H*, 4: 48; *G*, 5: 108; *B*, 7: 289; *ПН*, 9: 35; *T*, 15: 69; *НК*, 42: 40; and *Tр*, p. 87. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 87; and *БЛДР* 1: 118–119. According to Tatishchev, 2: 51, Vladimir was born in the village of Budjatin'.

him throughout his lifetime. That he was a Christian did not vitiate the matter. And his marriage to the daughter of Bolesław Chrobry, the king of Poland who espoused Latin Christianity, intensified the political and religious concerns of the Orthodox Rus' annalists. Although most probably Vladimir had arranged the marriage, in view of the peaceful relations then extant with Poland and the desire of the Kievan prince to enhance the diplomatic image of his principedom through favorable marriages for his sons and daughters, political and religious considerations dictated that the early Rus' writers view with suspicion Svjatopolk's union with a Polish bride. Their paramount fear and at the same time Svjatopolk's "cardinal sin" were the annalists' belief that he and his Polish father-in-law would attempt to Latinize the Rus' church. Whether or not there is validity for this assumption, given the emotional aspects identified with the issue, remains a subject of divided opinion in modern Russian and Polish scholarship with no clear resolution of the problem nor the issues attendant with it. The Rus' sources further attribute to Svjatopolk his desire to bribe the troops loyal to his father and to plot the murders of his brothers¹³⁶ so that he might gain the Kievan seat.

A religious proscription upon rulership then appears in *ПѢД* and reinforces the annalists' contempt for Svjatopolk. When he laid plans to kill his brothers and to rule alone, *ПѢД* relates:¹³⁷

СѢПОЛКЪ ЖЕ СЪ ШКА[АН]НЬНЫИ И ЗЛЫИ ... ПОМЫСЛЕНЪ ВЫСОКОУМЬЕМЪ СВОИМЪ НЕ ВѢДЫИ: ККО БѢ ДАЕТЪ ВЛАСТЬ ЕМУЖЕ ХОЩЕТЪ ПОСТАВЛЕТЪ БО ЦРѢ И КНАЗѢ ВЫШНИИ: ЕМУЖЕ ХОЩЕТЪ ДАЕТЪ: АЩЕ БО КАКА ЗЕМЛА ОУПРАВНЕНА ПРѢ БѢМЪ: ПОСТАВЛЕТЪ ЕИ ЦРѢ ИЛИ КНАЗѢ ПРАВЕДНА: ЛЮБАЩА СУДЪ: И ПРАВДУ: И БЛАСТЕЛА ОУСТРАИЕТЪ: И СУДЬЮ ПРАВАЩАГО СУДЪ: АЩЕ БО КНАЗИ ПРАВЪДНИ БЫВАЮТЪ В ЗЕМЛИ: ТО МНОГО ШДАЮТЪ СОГРѢШЕНЬА [ЗЕМЛИ]: АЩЕ ЛИ ЗЛИ И ЛУКАВИ БЫВАЮТЪ: ТО БОЛШЕ ЗЛО НАВОДИТЪ БѢ НА ЗЕМЛЮ: ПОНЕЖЕ ТО ГЛАВА ЕСТЬ ЗЕМЛИ:

This Svjatopolk, the cursed and evil, ... thought about his own lofty ideas and did not know that God grants authority to whomever He wishes, for He appoints emperors and higher princes. The Almighty gives [authority] to

¹³⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 132 f.; 2: 118 f.; *Н*, 3: 169; *Н*, 4: 105; *С*, 5: 125; *В*, 7: 318 f.; *ПН*, 9: 70; *Т*, 15: 123; *Х*, 22/1: 368; *НК*, 42: 58; and *Тр*, pp. 122–123. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 130; and *БЛДР* 1: 182–183. For the ideological, political, and religious struggle between Svjatopolk and Jaroslav, cf. esp. Nazarenko, ch. 10.

¹³⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 139–140; 2: 126–127; *Н*, 3: 558, but only in Appendix 3; *Н*, 4: 105; *ПН*, 9: 74; an emended passage in *ВЛ*, 30: 41; *НК*, 42: 60; and *Тр*, pp. 126–127. This passage is excised from *С*, *В*, and *Т*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 130; and *БЛДР* 1: 182–183. Shaikin, p. 140, concentrates on the significance of two phrases: *ЗЕМЛА ОУПРАВНЕНА ПРѢ БѢМЪ* and *КНАЗѢ ПРАВЕДНА*, elaborating not on their biblical significance and its application to earthly power, but the link between the prince and the land. He views this as an adaptation of an archaic notion of the "supernatural" role of the "tsar." Cf. his n. 654.

whomever He desires. If such a land is justified before God, He establishes in it a just Caesar [that is emperor] or prince who loves law and justice, and He sets up a governor and a judge who administer the law. For if the princes are righteous in the land, then many sins [of the land] are remitted. But if they are evil and deceitful, then God brings upon the land a greater evil because he is the head of the land.

The passage, probably a postexilic text that presupposes the existence of monarchy, is for the most part borrowed from the thoughts, writings, and later accretions introduced into the Old Testament chapters of Isaiah,¹³⁸ who lived at a time, the eighth century BC, of great emergency for Israel. Isaiah tried to convey to his people the enormity of their plight. This passage also conveys a weak theological basis for monarchy and places greater emphasis upon a covenant existing between God and a nation, now the Rus', which must be renewed upon the succession of each new prince.

The *ПВЛ* accounts of the deaths of Boris and Gleb¹³⁹ and the various redactions of *Сказаніа о свѣтыхъ Борисѣ и Глѣбѣ* (*The Legend of the Saintly Boris and Gleb*)¹⁴⁰ advance the notion that Boris was the elect of God to succeed to the princely seat at Kiev and in their hearts the residents of the

¹³⁸ The cited quotation appears to be a variant text drawn and emended from *Isaiah* xxxii. 1–8. Cf. i. 1–31, ii. 1–5, iii. 1–5, and vii. 21–x. 14. Notice especially the just reign of the ideal king David, ix. 1–9. The Rus' annalists make no attempt to portray either Vladimir or Jaroslav in the likeness of David, but reserve the Hebrew king as an ideal role model who stands apart in his accomplishments from all of these rulers.

¹³⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 132–139; 2: 118–126; *Нл*, 3: 169–174; *Нл*, 4: 99–105; *Сл*, 5: 125–131; *Вл*, 7: 318–324; *ПН*, 9: 71–73, with the addition, pp. 73–74, of *Похвала страстотропцемъ Борису и Глѣбу*; *Т*, 15: 123–134; *Вл*, 30: 42; *НК*, 42: 58–60; and *Тр*, pp. 122–126. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 126–130; and *БЛДР* 1: 176–183.

¹⁴⁰ The major redactions of this *Legend* appear in *ПСРЛ* 25: 7–8, under the 1072 entry; I.I. Sreznevsky, *Сказанія о свѣтыхъ Борисѣ и Глѣбѣ. Сильвестровскій списокъ XIV вѣка* (St. Petersburg, 1860); *Сборникъ XII вѣка Московскаго Успенскаго Собора*, eds. A.A. Shakhmatov and P.A. Lavrov, 1 (Moscow, 1899): 12–40; Serebriansky, 2: 27–47 and 163–164; D.I. Abramovich, *Житія свѣтихъ мучениковъ Борися и Глѣба и службы имъ*, Памятники Древне-Русской Литературы, 2-й том (Petrograd, 1916): 27–66; S.A. Bugoslavsky, *Україно-руські пам'ятки XI-XVIII ст. про князів Бориса та Гліба* (Kiev, 1928); and *Russische Heiligenlegenden*, eds. and trans. E. Benz, et al. (Zurich, 1953), pp. 50–73. Cf. the substantive essay: “The Cult of Boris and Gleb,” with extensive notes in Hollingsworth, pp. xxvi–lvii.

Commentaries upon the *Legend* appear in Shakhmatov, *Разысканія, passim*; G.P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity, the Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*, 1 (Cambridge, 1946): 94–110; N.N. Il'in, *Летописная статья 6523 года и ее источник. (Опыт анализа)* (Moscow, 1957); G.P. Fedotov, *Святые древней Руси. (X-XVIII ст.)* (2nd ed., New York, 1959), pp. 18–31; and L. Müller, *Die altrussischen hagiographischen Erzählungen und liturgischen Dichtungen über die Heiligen Boris und Gleb* (Munich, 1967). Also worthy of note is the study of B.A. Uspensky, *Борис и Глеб: Воспріятіе исторіи в древней Руси* (Moscow, 2000).

town were with the young prince.¹⁴¹ Further, and coincidentally, the death of Vladimir, eulogized in the Rus' annals, marks the termination of a great period of wealth and of national and religious pride, and there follows in the literature of that period a presentiment that the Poles, as the Assyrians of the Old Testament who overran the Hebrew states, would engulf the Kievan principality. The chapters of *Isaiah* are called upon to furnish evidence that Svjatopolk had usurped power and until his flight in 1019 had contributed to the Rus' national and religious humiliation. And as the Assyrians had forced their pagan deities upon the Hebrews, so too the Rus' under Polish overlordship would be required to adopt the Latin religious ceremonial and teachings. Isaiah denounced the Hebrew national sin and the Rus' scribes took confidence in his narrative, drawing upon the illustration that Svjatopolk's rule and the Polish domination would parallel the Assyrian arrogation of political and religious power. The passages of *Isaiah* are drawn upon to provide additional proof that God is both an accuser and a judge, and therefore His will cannot be violated and the impious and morally corrupt rule of Svjatopolk must end.¹⁴²

The legendary account of Svjatopolk's flight before the armies of Jaroslav, the devil's visitation upon him, the softening of his bones, and his tortuous death are vivid details provided by the scribes as an admonition to the Rus' princes, seeking to demonstrate to them that¹⁴³

... ДА АЩЕ СНИ ЕЩЕ ЕЩЕ ЖЕ СТВОРАТЬ [СЕ СЛЫШАВШЕ ТУ* КАЗНЬ ПРИМУТ* НО Н БОЛЬШН СЕЕ: ПОНЕ* ВѢДАА СЕ СЪТВОРАТЬ] ТАКОЖЕ ЗЛО*

... if they still do so [having heard this, they shall incur punishment, but an even greater one because knowing they have done] this evil.

ПВЛ then appends a moral drawn from the Old Testament texts, and compares Svjatopolk to Abimelech (АВМЕХЪ, АБИМЕЛЕХЪ), stating that he was the son of Gideon, an eleventh-century BC Israelite judge and hero who

¹⁴¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 132; 2: 118; *Н*₁, 3: 169; *Н*₂, 4: 99; *В*₁, 30: 41; and *НН*, 42: 58; but not stated in *С*₁, *В*, *ПН*, *Т*, and *Тр*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 126; and *БЛДР* 1: 176–177.

¹⁴² *ПСРЛ* 1: 139–140; 2: 126–127; *Н*₂, 4: 105; *ПН*, 9: 74; *НН*, 42: 60; and *Тр*, pp. 126–127. The account of the death of Svjatopolk and the biblical admonition do not appear in *Н*₁, *С*₁, *В*, and *Т*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 130; and *БЛДР* 1: 182–183.

¹⁴³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 145; and *Тр*, p. 130. *ПСРЛ* 2: 132–133, reads differently: ДА АЩЕ ЕЩЕ ЖЕ СТВОРАТЬ СЕ СЛЫШАВШЕ. ТУ ЖЕ КАЗНЬ ПРИМУТЬ. НО БОЛЬШН СЕА. ПОНЕЖЕ СЕ ВѢДУЩЕ БЫВШЕЕ. СТВОРИТИ ТАКОЕ ЖЕ ЗЛО БРАТООУБИИТЕВО, “if they still do so, having heard this, they shall incur punishment, but a greater one because previously knowing this, they have committed this evil of fratricide.” Like *ПВЛ–Н*, so also *Н*₂, 4: 110; *С*₁, 5: 133; *Т*, 15: 139, with some emendation; and *НН*, 42: 62; but omitted in *Н*₁, *В*, *Л*, and *ПН*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 133; and *БЛДР* 1: 188–189.

defeated the Midianites and ruled Israel for forty years. Gideon fathered Abimelech in adultery with a Canaanite woman and this son became an immoral rival of his half-brothers.¹⁴⁴ Abimelech made the first effort to establish an Israelite monarchy, but he left no offspring to continue family rule. There is a temptation to read into this analogy, although the Rus' annalists furnish no substantiation for such a suspicion, questions to be raised concerning the very conception of Svjatopolk during Vladimir's adulterous act or rather rape. The claim that he was "born of two fathers" and that he came under the tutelage of his Polish father-in-law who was seeking to establish a monarchy in Kievan Rus' with ties to Rome rather than Constantinople and thus bring about the Latinization of the Rus' church vitiated against him. From a religious standpoint, the Rus' copyists found all of these potential consequences wholly alarming and unacceptable.

Like Solomon, Vladimir is depicted as a ruler conspicuous for his commanding stature and his gift of wisdom. Each was devoted to the service of God and the kingdom of Solomon prospered, as did the principality of Vladimir. However, neither the sons of Solomon nor those of Vladimir, perhaps with the exception of Jaroslav, Boris, and Gleb, were consecrated to the spiritual performance of duties, although we cannot establish this with any certitude for all of Vladimir's offspring, including those unnamed sons during the fratricidal conflict, because of the silence of the sources. Consequently, it is elaborated that for their apostasy they suffered the penalty and the wrath of God, assuming that this applies both for Solomon's and Vladimir's sons, or only selectively to some sons. Having claimed the issue of apostasy, the Rus' annalistic argumentation then conforms to Old Testament historiographic regularity and order, and like the division of Solomon's kingdom into two parts, so too Vladimir's state was apportioned between two sons, Jaroslav and Mstislav. Disputes over excessive taxation had been an issue common to Solomon, Vladimir, and their sons. The death of Solomon ushered in the formation of two rival kingdoms, Ephraim (Israel) and Judah. Their histories are most briefly related in the *Books of Kings* and in the later and less reliable *Books of Chronicles*, which almost exclusively

¹⁴⁴ Zenkovsky, 1: 135, n. 31, believes that this Abimelech was the son of Jerubbaal, not Gideon. *Judges* ix. 1–6 cites two sons that bear this name, one by Gideon, and the other by Jerubbaal. It is the former that Slavic annals make reference to, not the latter. Further, *IICP/I* 1: 145–146; 2: 133; *Hs*, 4: 110; *Cj*, 5: 133 (the text compares favorably to *PKA-d*); *L*, 7: 327; *PH*, 9: 76–77; *T*, 15: 139–140; *HK*, 42: 62; and *Tp*, pp. 130–131. The comparison is omitted in *Hj* and *Ls*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 134; and *БЛДП* 1: 188–189.

concerns itself with Judah. At Solomon's expiration, his son Rehoboam was petitioned by the Israelites for more generous treatment and some relief from the oppressive levies. Refusing their request, Israel broke off from the district of Judah and established an independent state. The creation of the northern kingdom of Ephraim, populated by a people known for their haughtiness and high-spiritedness, came under the rule of Jeroboam, formerly one of Solomon's officers. Judah retained the territory extending southward from a point a few miles north of Jerusalem. The Old Testament text stresses that the Israelites' troubles stem from divine punishment for their schismatic idolatry—a consequence of racial miscegenation and religious interaction with the Philistines. Judah, on the other hand, enjoyed an unbroken dynasty.¹⁴⁵

The stylistic absence of detailed elaborations upon the kingdoms of Ephraim and Judah appears to have served as a model for the briefer descriptions awarded to the twin principalities ruled by Jaroslav and Mstislav between 1019 and 1036. The division of Kievan Rus' was formally achieved in 1026 when Jaroslav and Mstislav tired after seven years of internecine conflict that had arrived at no clear resolution of their differences.¹⁴⁶ Their peace settlement established the boundary between their states along the course of the Dnieper River. Jaroslav received the lands to the west and made Kiev his capital, although he had difficulty occupying the town because he was at odds with its inhabitants. Mstislav acquired the eastern parts and moved his political center from Tmutorokan' in the eastern Crimea to Chernigov, a fortified town situated on the Desna River, some seventy miles to the north-east of Kiev. The geographical relationship of Chernigov to Kiev appears to have satisfied the Rus' annalists' need to establish historiographic continuity between the post-Vladimirian and post-Solomonic states.¹⁴⁷ And conforming

¹⁴⁵ For the histories of Ephraim and Judah, cf. *IKings* xii. 1-xiv. 20; and *IIChronicles* x. 1-xii. 15.

¹⁴⁶ *ПЦПЛ* 1: 146–150; 2: 134–138; *Н*, 4: 111–114; *С*, 5: 134–136 (the death and the eulogization of Mstislav are absent in this text; also notably, like Jaroslav, Mstislav is identified as a “grand prince”); *Б*, 7: 328–330; *ПН*, 9: 77–79; and *Тр*, pp. 133–134 (accounts of Mstislav's death and a brief eulogy are absent from these annals); *Т*, 15: 143–146 (again Mstislav is identified as a “grand prince”); and *НН*, 42: 62–63. Further, accounts concerning Mstislav's death and eulogization do not appear in *Н*, *Д*, and *В*. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 134–136; and *БЛДР* 1: 188–193. For a critical examination of the struggle between Mstislav and Jaroslav, cf. I.M. Shekera, *Кы́йська Русь XI ст. у міжнародних відносинах* (Kiev, 1967), pp. 109 ff.

¹⁴⁷ *ПЦПЛ* 1: 149; 2: 137; *Н*, 4: 113; *С*, 5: 135–136; *Б*, 7: 329; *ПН*, 9: 79; *Т*, 15: 145; *Д*, 20/1: 90; and *НН*, 42: 64. The passage relating to the peace agreement and division of the Kievan lands is absent from *Н*. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 135–136; and *БЛДР* 1: 190–191.

to Old Testament texts, the bulk of the narrative discussion in *ПВЛ* between 1019 and 1036 concentrates upon the activities and accomplishments of Jaroslav and precious little information is furnished on Mstislav's rule. Perhaps scribal concern of a reoccurrence of racial miscegenation and religious interaction that had emerged between the Hebrews and Philistines would now appear among the Rus' and Mstislav's allies—the Kasogi and Pechenegs who in substantial numbers resided on his territory. This potential prospect may have introduced an annalistic suspicion that a similar process was evolving and thus would lead to racial and religious corruption. Mstislav appears, however, to be absolved in the early Rus' annals of attempting to introduce pagan elements when in 1022, having defeated in personal combat Rededia, the chieftain of the Kasogi, he constructed in Tmutorokan' a church dedicated to the Holy Virgin as thanksgiving for divine intervention in his behalf.¹⁴⁸ But his obituary notice in 1036, aside from providing a description of his physical features, is a weak acclaim at best and tempers the importance of his rule, commenting:¹⁴⁹

ХРАБОРЪ НА РАТИ· МЛѢВЪ· ЛЮБОВШЕ ДРУЖИНУ ПО БЕЛКУ· НМѢНЯ НЕ ЦАДОВШЕ НИ ПИТЬЯ· НИ ЪДЕНЯ БРАНОВШЕ·

[He was] brave in war, kind, a greater lover of his retinue. He spared [them] neither riches, nor drink, nor prohibited [them] food.

The compilers of *ПВЛ* provide no descriptions of his princely powers, with the exception that several annals (*G*, and *T*) identify him as a “grand prince,” and so also Jaroslav. The annalistic accounts are generally brief statements and provide little insight into the nature of Mstislav's rule.

Certain common elements, however, are to be found in the descriptions of the reigns of Rehoboam and Jaroslav, at least for the year 1036. We are told that each made significant contributions toward the strengthening of their realm's defenses. Rehoboam built cities to fortify his kingdom against Egyptian attacks.¹⁵⁰ In 1030 Jaroslav founded the town of Iur'ev on the Embach River (Emajõgi in modern Estonia) and two years later he began to construct towns along the Ros' River.¹⁵¹ Both rulers also attempted to regain lost

¹⁴⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 147; 2: 134; *H*, 4: 111; *G*, 5: 134; *B*, 7: 328; *ПН*, 9: 78; *T*, 15: 143; *HK*, 42: 62; and *Tp*, p. 131. It is excised from *H*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 134; and *БЛДР* 1: 188–189.

¹⁴⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 150; 2: 138 (with a slight alteration of the text); *H*, 4: 113–114; *G*, 5: 136 (entered for the year 1034 [6542]); *B*, 7: 330; *ПН*, 9: 79; *T*, 15: 146 (also for the year 1034 [6542]); *A*, 20/1: 90; and *HK*, 42: 63. Not in *H* and *EA*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 136; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–193.

¹⁵⁰ *IKings* xiv. 25–31; and *IIChronicles* xi. 5.

¹⁵¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 149 and 150; 2: 137; *H*, 4: 113; *G*, 5: 136; *B*, 7: 329 (gives the date of construction as

territory. Rehoboam not only attacked the Egyptians, but as well launched forays against the Israelites.¹⁵² Jaroslav with the mutual support of Mstislav gathered a large force and marched against Poland where the brothers reoccupied the Red cities.¹⁵³ Rehoboam's rule of Judah spanned a period of seventeen years and this length of time corresponds with the duration of Jaroslav's divided rule with Mstislav. While the Hebrews remained faithful to Yahweh during Rehoboam's reign, no divine castigation against the Rus' is recorded in *ПВЛ* because of the division of the Kievan state and for the same period neither heavenly acknowledgement nor disapproval of their dual rule appears in the sources. Mere inattention to a detailed accounting of their governance was sufficient to demonstrate perhaps divine displeasure and to obscure the relevance of this period.

The death of Mstislav in 1036 produced a major historiographic problem for the compilers of *ПВЛ*. The main question for them was how to reconcile Jaroslav's rule hereafter with Old Testament accounts. Had history repeated itself, Jaroslav and not Mstislav should have expired. With the death of Rehoboam, the kingdom of Judah declines and we witness the rise of the northern kingdom under the kingship of the Israelite general Omri, who reigned for twelve years.¹⁵⁴ He receives very brief notice in the *Books of Kings* and none in the *Books of Chronicles*. This willful neglect is attributed to his infidelity to Yahweh.¹⁵⁵ Old Testament tradition could yet serve as a suitable manual for describing the next half of Jaroslav's rule, but we witness significant adjustments to this ancient cycle of history.

First, the scribes of *ПВЛ* had to establish a comprehensive recognition of the unlimited nature of Jaroslav's powers and to demonstrate his ability to rule a reunified state. In the entry for 1036, *ПВЛ* states:¹⁵⁶

1027 [6535] and 330; *ПН*, 9: 79; *Т*, 15: 146; *НН*, 42: 63; and *Тр*, p. 133. No entries for 1030 (6540) and 1032 (6540) appear in *Н*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 136; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–193.

¹⁵² *IKings* xiv. 25 ff.

¹⁵³ For the year 1031 (6539), *ПСП* 1: 150; 2: 137; *Н*, 4: 113; *С*, 5: 136; *В*, 7: 330; *ПН*, 9: 79; *Т*, 15: 146; *В*, 30: 44; *НН*, 42: 63; and *Тр*, p. 133. No entry for that year appears in *Н*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 136; *БЛДР* 1: 192–193; and F. Persowski, *Studia nad pograniczem Polsko-Ruskim w X–XI wieku* (Wrocław, Warsaw, and Cracow, 1962), p. 89.

¹⁵⁴ *IKings* xvi. 21–24.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 25–28.

¹⁵⁶ *ПСП* 1: 150; like *ПВЛ–А*, so too *Н*, 4: 114; *С*, 5: 136, but entered for the year 1034 (6542); *В*, 7: 330, also for the 1034 (6542); *Т*, 15: 146; and *НН*, 42: 63. An emended and brief statement, but for the year 1033, appears in *В*, 30: 44. *ПВЛ–А*, 2: 138, substitutes *ЕДИНОВАСТЕЦЬ* for *САМОВАСТЕЦЬ*, but with no appreciable alteration in meaning and intent. *Н* lacks an entry for 1036 (6542), while *ПН*, *Х*, and *Тр* make no reference to the extent of his authority. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 136, where Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor render this term, that is, *САМОВАСТЕЦЬ*, as

ПОСЕМЬ ЖЕ ПЕРВА ВЛАСТЬ ЕГО БИЮ ЯРОСЛАВЪ · И БЫ САМОВАЛЪСТЕЦЪ РУСЬСТЪИ
ЗЕМАНЪ

Afterwards, Jaroslav aspired for all his powers and was the autocrat of the Rus' land.

The intent of the scribes, herein, appears to be to stress that he enjoyed absolute powers, much like the contemporaneous Byzantine emperors. No such attribution of absolute authority, however, appears in the sources for his father, Vladimir.

The only apparent and recorded challenge to Jaroslav's claim to absolute rule came from his brother Sudislav, the prince of Pskov and *ПОСАДЬНИКЪ* of a center known for its centrifugal tendencies and aspirations for local self-rule. Jaroslav incarcerated his brother during the tenure of his own rule and in that manner resolved the issue.¹⁵⁷ And with this statement, the early Rus' annalists achieved recognition for his full sovereignty over a unified Kievan Rus' land and the indivisibility of the powers that he had inherited from his father Vladimir, although in reality each ruler upon ascending the seat had to demonstrate through a force of arms and other means their worthiness to rule. Further, through total silence the scribes avoid any further mention in the annals and other written works of the presence of divisive and separatist elements among his sons and their followers.

Jaroslav as well demonstrated his abilities as a defender of the principality with a decisive victory over the Pechenegs in the same year that he assumed sole rule. He gathered a large force of Varangians and Slavs and successfully thwarted the Pecheneg drive to take Kiev.¹⁵⁸ Two years later after this major victory, he gave further evidence of his suitability to defend his state by turning his attention to the western frontier and to the recurring problems attendant with the protection and maintenance of Rus' commercial routes with western markets. In a terse entry, *ПВА* very briefly relates that he ordered an assault upon the Jatvjagi (Iatviangi, Iatvingians), a Lithuanian tribe inhabiting the lower Bug River basin and a threat to his commercial

"sole ruler." They may have been influenced in their translation by later redactions of *ПВА*. *БЛДР* 1: 192–193, employs *единовластець*.

¹⁵⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 151; 2: 139; *Н*₄, 4: 114; *С*₁, 5: 137; *В*, 7: 330; *ПН*, 9: 80; *Т*, 15: 147; *НК*, 42: 64; and *Тр*, p. 134. No entry appears for 1036 (6544) in *Н*₁. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–193.

¹⁵⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 150–151; 2: 138–139 (with some textual alteration in the narrative); *Н*₄, 4: 114; *С*₁, 5: 136–137; *В*, 7: 330; *Т*, 15: 147; *НК*, 42: 63–64; and *Тр*, p. 134; but not entered in *Н*₁, *Х*, and *ПН*. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 136–137; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–193.

intercourse with the Red cities and other trading centers.¹⁵⁹ In 1040 he perhaps again, because they remained a threat to his western interests, attacked this same tribe whose name is omitted in the sources and they are simply identified as “the Lithuanians.”¹⁶⁰ The following year he further consolidated and protected the links with the west by launching a naval attack upon the Mazovi, one of several Polish peoples, and their settlements above the Pripet marshes.¹⁶¹ Although *ПБА-А* relates no events for the year 1046, their resistance was not crushed until the campaigns of 1046–1047 when Jaroslav finally subdued them and placed them under the suzerainty of Casimir I, the king of Poland (1032–1052).¹⁶² Jaroslav’s attack in 1043 upon the Byzantine Empire was mainly an attempt to reformulate a more favorable relationship *vis-à-vis* their emperors and the patriarchs of Constantinople. The various aspects of this assault and its implication for the Rus’ and Byzantines will be more extensively analyzed in the next chapter. Peace between these states was concluded three years later. Jaroslav could claim neither a military nor diplomatic victory, for the fortunes of battle and natural elements favored the Greeks and were of disadvantage to the Kievan Rus’.¹⁶³ Without a clear military victory, Jaroslav had no alternative but to anticipate lower expectations in the resulting diplomatic negotiations. The annalists saw no contradictions during Jaroslav’s rule in the conduct of his Polish and Byzantine policies, nor did they view them as a challenge to their own pro-Byzantine religious sympathies. His military achievements and even defeats served to enhance his reputation as a defender of the primary political, religious, and economic interests of the Kievan principality.

The *ПБА* entry for 1037 (6545) demonstrates the accomplishments of Jaroslav as a builder. The text recounts that he first erected the great citadel near the Golden Gate in Kiev, and then he began construction of the

¹⁵⁹ *ПСПЛ* 1: 153; 2: 141; *H*₁, 4: 114; *G*₁, 5: 137; *B*, 7: 331; *ПН*, 9: 81; *T*, 15: 148; *ВЛ*, 30: 45; *HK*, 42: 63; and *T*_р, p. 135. No entry appears in *H*₁. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 138; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195.

¹⁶⁰ *ПСПЛ* 1: 153; 2: 141; *G*₁, 5: 137; *B*, 7: 331; *ПН*, 9: 82; *T*, 15: 148; *ВЛ*, 30: 45; and *T*_р, p. 135. No entries for that year appear in *H*₁, *H*₂, and *HK*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 138; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195.

¹⁶¹ *ПСПЛ* 1: 153; 2: 141; *H*₂, 4: 116; *G*₁, 5: 137; *B*, 7: 331; *ПН*, 9: 82; *T*, 15: 148; *ВЛ*, 30: 45; *HK*, 42: 64; and *T*_р, p. 137. No entry appears in *H*₁. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 138; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195 and 509.

¹⁶² *ПСПЛ* 1: 155; 2: 143; *H*₁, 3: 181; *H*₂, 4: 116; *G*₁, 5: 138; *ПН*, 9: 83; *ВЛ*, 30: 45; *HK*, 42: 64; and *T*_р, p. 137. However, *B*, *ПСПЛ* 7: 332, cites the conflict only for the year 1046 (6554); so also *T*, 15: 150. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 138; and *БЛДР* 1: 196–197. For a Polish account of this attack, cf. *MPH* 1 (Lemberg-Cracow, 1864): 417–418.

¹⁶³ *ПСПЛ* 1: 154; 2: 142; *G*₁, 5: 137–138; *B*, 7: 331; *ПН*, 9: 82; *T*, 15: 148–149; *А*, 20/1: 90, identifies Jaroslav as a “grand prince” who launched the attack upon the Greeks in 1043, and again in 1054, the year of his death; and *T*_р, p. 136. The account of the Rus’ attack upon the Greeks is excised from *H*₁, *H*₂, *ВЛ*, and *HK*. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 138–139; and *БЛДР* 1: 196–197 and 509.

metropolitan church of Saint Sophia and thereafter those of the Annunciation over the Golden Gate, the monastery of Saint George, and the convent of Saint Irene.¹⁶⁴ Citations of constructional accomplishments are customarily reserved for eulogies in the annals or appear in separate works, and are frequently entered chronologically as separate entries as their erection occurs. But the Rus' annalists, while drawing upon the distinguishing characteristics of Old Testament rulership and using these attributes of a notable ruler as a guide in their own annals, had to satisfy their need to break with this ancient historiographic tradition and note the monuments he undertook to construct at the inception of sole rule. However, the undertaking of five major projects in the same year appears unlikely and unrealistic, given the extensive cost and the human resources and material requirements for such constructions, and leads to the suspicion that *ПРЛ* is less than credible in making this claim. Although there remains the possibility that this account is an exception, it is more probable that the idea of their construction was contemplated in that year, but the actual construction was spread out over a number of years. We should also admit that the Rus' scribes might have sought to lessen the stain of Jaroslav's rebellion against his saintly father, and recount his construction of religious edifices at the outset of his sole rule of Kievan Rus' to mollify their opinions of him.

In the same period that Jaroslav undertook the elaborate construction of numerous ecclesiastical structures, he issued his *УСТАВЪ* (Decree) for the regulation of all levels of Rus' society. The laws provide insight into the role of both males and females, their offspring, as well as other elements in the ecclesiastical well-being of the Rus', in the everyday life of the principality. Whether the laws are of Slavic provenance or of Byzantine Christian influence remains a subject for scholarly disputation.¹⁶⁵

For the compilers of *ПРЛ*, Jaroslav's undertaking to construct religious establishments evidenced his predilection for monastic institutions that came to be identified as centers of intellectual activity, much as one encounters in Byzantine institutions, and thus the Rus' institutions are modeled after the Byzantine. And for these Rus' centers he gathered scholars and

¹⁶⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 151; 2: 139; *Н*, 4: 114; *С*, 5: 137; *В*, 7: 330; *ПН*, 9: 80–81, wherein the main reference is to the church of Saint Sophia and only generally to the others; *Т*, 15: 147; and *Тр*, p. 134. *Н*, *ПСРЛ* 3: 130, makes reference only to the "completion" of the church of Saint Sophia; so also *НК*, 42: 64; *Х*, 22/1: 368, adds the notation that Jaroslav in 1045 (6553) built the church of Saint Sophia in Novgorod. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–195.

¹⁶⁵ For the numerous redactions of the *УСТАВЪ*, cf. Shchapov, *Древнерусские княжеские уставы*, pp. 85–139.

translators to render Greek texts into Slavonic and according to *ПВЛ* he himself wrote and accumulated books for these monastic establishments.¹⁶⁶ *ПВЛ* further elaborates:¹⁶⁷

КАКОЖЕ БО ЕЕ НѢКТО ЗЕМЛЮ РАЗОРИТЬ· ДРУГИИ ЖЕ НАСѢЕТЬ· НИИ ЖЕ ПОЖИНАЮТЬ·
И ИДАТЬ ПИЩЮ БЕСКУДНУ· ТАКО И СЪ· ШЦЬ БО ЕГО ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ [ЗЕМЛЮ] ВЗОРА·
И ОУМАЧН РЕКШЕ КРЩИЬЕМЪ ПРОСВѢТНВЬ· СЪ ЖЕ НАСѢА КНИЖНЫМИ СЛОВЕСЫ СРЦА
ВЪРНѢИ ЛЮДИИ· А МЫ ПОЖИНАЕМЪ ОУЧЕНЬЕ ПРИЕМАЮЩЕ КНИЖНОЕ· БЕЛКА БО БЫВА-
ЮЕТЬ ПОЛЗА Ꙗ ОУЧЕНЬА КНИЖНОГО· КНИГАМИ БО КАЖЕМИ И ОУЧИМИ ИЕЗМЫ· ПУТИ
ПОКАЯНЫЮ· МДРТЬ БО ШЕРѢТАЕМЪ И ВЪЗДЕРЖАНЬЕ· Ꙗ СЛОВЕСЪ КНИЖНЫХЪ· ЕЕ БО
СУТЬ РѢКЫ НАПАЮЩЕ ВСЕЛЕНЮЮ· ЕЕ СУТЬ НСОУДИЩА М[УДР]ОСТИ·

For as one disturbs [plows] the earth, another sows, and others reap and eat food without scarcity, and so did he [Jaroslav]. His father [Vladimir] disturbed [plowed the land] and said to the unclean 'be enlightened through baptism.' He [Jaroslav] sowed the hearts of the faithful people with the written word and we reap the teachings of the accepted books. Great is the benefit from book learning. Through books we are shown and taught the way of repentance, for wisdom and continence are found from the written word. They are the rivers filling the universe. They are the springs of wisdom.

Wisdom now becomes a vehicle for justifying the correctness of Jaroslav's sole rule. And drawing upon the words to Solomon, *ПВЛ* interlocks in its argumentation a relationship between wisdom and rulership, and quotes:¹⁶⁸

АЗЪ ПРМДРТЬ ВСЕЛН· СВѢТЪ [И] РАЗУМЪ И МЫСЛЬ· АЗЪ ПРИЗВѢ СТРАХЪ ГНЬ· МОИ
СВѢТИ· МОИ МДРТЬ· МОЕ ОУТВЕРЖЕНЬЕ· МОИ КРѢПОСТЬ· МНОЮ ЦРВЕ ЦРѢВУЮТЬ· А
ИЛАННИ ПИШЮТ ПРАВДУ· МНОЮ ВЕЛЬМОЖА ВЕЛИЧАЮТСА· И МЧТЛН ДЕРЖАТЬ ЗЕМЛЮ·
АЗЪ ЛЮБАЩАИ МА ЛЮБЛЮ· НИЩОЩИ МЕНЕ ШЕРЩЮТЬ [БЛАГОДАТЬ]·

I [Wisdom] have spread in the universe light, reason, and reflection. I have summoned fear of the Lord. Mine is illumination, mine is wisdom, mine is countenance, and mine is strength. Through me rulers rule, and the mighty decree justice. I love those who love me. Those who seek me [shall be adorned with beneficence].

¹⁶⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 151–152; 2: 139–140; *ПН*, 9: 80–81, with some additional elaboration. Noteworthy also is the account in *K*, 21/1: 169, and its treatment of Jaroslav's love of labor and reference to his writing of numerous books, although apparent exaggerations are incorporated into this text; and *Тр*, pp. 134–135. This account of his love of books is excised from *H*₁, *H*₄, *С*₁, *В*, *Т*, *НК*, and *ВЛ*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–195.

¹⁶⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 152; 2: 140, with some textual emendation and orthographic alteration; *ПН*, 9: 80; and *Тр*, pp. 134–135. This passage does not appear in *H*₁, *H*₄, *С*₁, *В*, *Т*, *НК*, and *ВЛ*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195. Shaikin, pp. 159–160, does not associate this passage and the love of books with the Wisdom Movement, but simply a biblical connection.

¹⁶⁸ *Proverbs* viii. 4 ff.; and *ПСРЛ* 1: 152; 2: 140; and *ПН*, 9: 80. This passage does not appear in *H*₁, *H*₄, *С*₁, *В*, *Т*, *НК*, *ВЛ*, *Х*, and *Тр*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195.

ПБА then asserts that, having sought wisdom in books, Jaroslav received great profit for his work.¹⁶⁹

His accomplishments in the accumulation of knowledge through reading, writing, and the collection of books has its parallel in the Old Testament Wisdom Movement that began to flourish during the rule of Solomon and spanned the course of ancient Hebrew history. The Wisdom Movement is a scrupulous cultural formulation and a polished literary achievement that seeks to establish God as a creator and governor of all things. Words become an indispensable vehicle for spiritual enlightenment and fulfillment of human life. In the *Book of Proverbs* we find no clear reference to Israel's national history and to her faith and religious institutions. There appears only an inference that in the time of numerous Hebrew kings the Wisdom Movement flourished. Only an incisive investigation of each of the kings from Solomon to Herod would admit the accurateness of this statement. The *Book of Proverbs* is disposed to be hopeful and anticipates that man can know the way of life and the fear of God. In the course of the second half of Jaroslav's rule, this prince became a patron of wisdom as the kings of Israel and Egypt, whose kingship, ancient Near Eastern thought maintained, was established by divine beings in their inauguration of the cosmological ordering of sentient beings. Parenthetically, we should stress that it is only in the second half of Jaroslav's rule that we can liken him to Solomon. Kings, therefore, were the symbol and the embodiment of divine authority, and had the means to gain wisdom and share in divine counsels. The wisdom by which kings rule is an eternal and divine quality. A dominant aspect of the Wisdom Movement is to place stress upon a path to knowledge rather than upon a life of faith, and the words gained from books are for all peoples and not merely for a privileged class of official servants. But *ПБА* makes no attempt to elaborate further upon the Wisdom Movement beyond its initial treatment in the 1037 entry. The early Rus' annalists appear to be satisfied that they had established a credible image of Jaroslav's intellectual powers and see no need beyond this statement to draw upon other Old Testament books to elaborate additionally upon Rus' parallels with the Wisdom Movement.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁹ *ПСПЛ* 1: 152–153; 2: 140–141; *ПН*, 9: 80; and *Тр*, p. 135. The praise of Jaroslav for his love of books does not appear in *Н₁*, *Н₄*, *С₁*, *Б*, *Т*, *НН*, *Х*, and *БА*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195.

¹⁷⁰ For studies of the Wisdom Movement and its literature, cf. W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Solomon, Translations of Early Documents*. Second Series. Hellenistic-Jewish Texts, 1 ((London-New York, 1917); H. Gressmann, *Israels Spruchweisheit im Zusammenhang der Weltliteratur, Kunst und Altertum. Alte Kulturen im Lichte neuer Forschung*, 6 (Berlin, 1925);

In the 1040s Hilarion, a presbyter of Jaroslav's church at Berestovo and a champion of the Monastery of the Crypts (ПЕЧЕРСКАЯ ЛАВРА) on the outskirts of Kiev as a center for Rus' intellectual and religious literary activity,¹⁷¹ provides further evidence in two works: *Слово о законѣ Моисеомъ, даннѣмъ. и о благодати и истинѣ, Иисусъ Христомъ бывшихъ* (A Discourse on the Laws, Given through Moses, and Of the Grace and the Truth Brought by Jesus Christ),¹⁷² and *Похваля Кагану Владимиру* (A Eulogy to the Khagan Vladimir),¹⁷³ to introduce a historiographic tradition more in keeping with the nature of Jaroslav's rulership after 1036. Hilarion departs from the stress placed upon Old Testament tradition as a means of defining princely power from ca. 980 to 1036, and elaborates in his *Discourse*:¹⁷⁴

Благословенъ Господъ Богъ Израилевъ, Богъ христіанскъ. яко повелѣти и сътвори изъбавленне людемъ своимъ. яко не прере тварн своєю до конца нѣдольскимъ мраченемъ гибнути, но оправданъ прежде племя йбраамле скрижалми и закономъ, послѣдъ же сыномъ своимъ вса мзыки спасе, евангеліемъ и хрещтеніемъ и ввѣдомъ въ обновленне (пакы) бытіа, въ жизнь вечную ... законъ бо предѣхъ бе слуга (благодати и истинне, истинна и благодать слуга) будущему веку, жизни нетленней, яко законъ провождааше всаконныа къ благодѣтельному хрещенію, крещенне же препущаетъ сыны своя на вечную жизнь. Моисей бо и пророци о Христовѣ прешествни проповѣдаху, Христовъ же и апостолицъ сго о вѣрѣеенни и о будущемъ вѣче Вѣра бо

W.O.E. Oosterley, *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament: In the Light of Newly Discovered Teaching of Amen-em-ope'* (London and New York, 1927); O.S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature, Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion: The Kerr Lectures Delivered in Trinity College, Glasgow, 1933–36* (Edinburgh, 1936; repr. 1954); and F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, DOS 9/1 (Washington, 1966): 357 ff. More recently, cf. B.W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament* (5th ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2007), *passim*.

¹⁷¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 155–160; 2: 143–149; *ПН* 9: 83–85; and *Тр*, pp. 137–140, furnish extensive descriptions of the foundation and intellectual development of the Crypt Monastery, also identified as the Monastery of the Caves. Discussion of the Crypt Monastery is absent from *Н*, *Н*₂ (notes its foundation, 4: 117), *С*, *В*, *Т*, *НК*, and *Вл*. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 139–142; and *БЛДР* 1: 196–203 and 509–510.

¹⁷² The work is more familiarly identified as the “Sermon on Law and Grace.” Butler, p. 25, correctly notes the similarity, lacking the extensive narrative detail found in *ПВЛ*, of the two sources. For the text, see Ponomarev, 1: 59–69; and for other renditions of this text, A.B. Gorsky, *Памятники духовной литературы времени великого князя Ярослава I-ого*, 1 (Moscow, 1844); V.I. Sreznevsky, *Мусин-Пушкинскіи Сборникъ*; and N.K. Nikol'sky, ed., “Слово о законѣ и Благодати,” in *Матеріаліи для древнерусской духовной литературы*, СОРЯС 82 (St. Petersburg, 1907): 28–55 (text: 32–55), and 75–122. Most recently, see the Slavonic and modern Russian translation in *БЛДР* 1: 26 ff. and 480–486. For an English rendition, cf. S. Franklin, *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'* (Cambridge, MA, 1991), pp. 3–29.

¹⁷³ Ponomarev, 1: 69–78.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 60, and 67; and *БЛДР* 1: 26–27, 38–39, and 481–484.

БЛАГОДАТНАА ПО ВСЕИ ЗЕМЛИ РАСПРОСТРЕСЯ И ДО НАШЕГО ЯЗЫКЕ РУКАГО ДНОДЕ, И ЗАКОННОЕ ЕЗЕРО ПРЕШЕ, ЕВАНГЕЛЬСКИИ ЖЕ ИСТОЧНИКЪ НАВОДНИСЯ И В СЮ ЗЕМЛЮ ПОКРУБЪЗ И ДО НАС ПРОЛНАВСЯ. СЕ БО БЖЕ И МЫ СЪ ВСЕМИ ХРИСТИАНУ СЛАВНИМУЪ СВЯТУЮ ТРОИЦУ, А ЮДЕИ МЛАНЧИТЪ....

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, the God of Christianity, Who communicated and brought salvation to the people. Who did not scorn His creatures that for ages had perished in idolatrous darkness, but He first revealed to the tribes of Abraham the Tablets and Laws; later, through His Son the Gospels and Baptism. He saved all nations and introduced [them] to renewed being, to life eternal For Law was the precursor and servant (of Grace and Truth; Grace and Truth were the servant) of future ages, of everlasting life. As Law led each of them to blessed baptism, baptism brought their sons to eternal life. Moses and the prophets announced the coming of Christ, [but] Christ and His apostles [announced] the resurrection and future being For this blessed faith spread across all lands and reached our Rus' nation, and while the lake of the Law dried up, the spring of the Gospels overflowed and inundated all lands and spilled over onto us. For we together with other Christians now glorify the Holy Trinity, but Judea is silent

Hilarion's *Discourse* preserves the key aspect of the Wisdom Movement. It does not cite parallel passages from the New Testament, nor for that matter from the Old Testament, as supporting evidence to establish that a momentous transformation in the nature of Jaroslav's rule had taken place. Further, in his *Eulogy*, Hilarion as an apologist for the Rus' Christian nation stresses that Jaroslav did not destroy Vladimir's laws, but confirmed them.¹⁷⁵ The Old Testament provided classic descriptions of the glories and achievements of ancient Hebrew kings. The New Testament became the instrument for conveying the image of a messianic expectation of literary strength and inspiration identifiable with the sole rule of Jaroslav. Thus there is implied in the *PKA* entries for 1036 and 1054 as in other contemporaneous writings an anticipation of a period of future glorified rule and of divine sovereignty, which was consummated through Vladimir's baptism, but is now realized with Jaroslav, the "grand prince" of all Kievan lands.¹⁷⁶ Paradoxically, this idealization was not to be realized with the advent of the disruptive appanage system following the death of Jaroslav.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 70. Cf. D.S. Likhachev, "Культура Киевской Руси при Ярославе Мудром," *ИЖ* 7 (1943): 31–33; and Pashuto, p. 82.

¹⁷⁶ For citations on the theme of the regeneration of mankind through baptism, cf. *ПСРЛ* 1: 104–106; 2: 89–92; *Н*, 3: 146–148; *Н*, 4: 75–78; *С*, 5: 115–120; *В*, 7: 297–304; *ПН*, 9: 50–52; *Т*, 15: 96–99; *НН*, 42: 45–51; and *Тр*, pp. 134–140. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 109; *БЛДР* 1: 152–155; and variously, Ponomarev, 1: 70–78.

The theme of regeneration recurs in Jaroslav's *Testament* (*Завѣщаніе*), prepared on the occasion of his death on 19 February 1054 (6562),¹⁷⁷ and is made concomitant with the succession question. In order to preclude a resumption of the confused succession crises and fraternal wars that followed Vladimir's passing and were mainly initiated by his large progeny brought forth through numerous wives and various women, Jaroslav advanced the notion of a firm family union based upon orderly princely advancement, perhaps founded upon the notion of seniority also described as "collateral succession" or a "staircase system," although this notion has been variously discussed by numerous scholars, providing various interpretations but arriving at no clear consensus of opinion among themselves.¹⁷⁸ He bequeathed to his eldest son Izjaslav the princely seat of Kiev and full political authority over the principality. Then in descending order of importance he gave Chernigov to Svjatoslav, Perejaslavl' to Vsevolod, the town of Vladimir to Igor, and Smolensk to Vjacheslav.¹⁷⁹ Jaroslav abandoned the clan patrimonial theory of rule that had been practiced by his forbearers and had been a cause for frequent internal strife. An important element in his *Testament* was stress upon the fact that his sons were of one father and mother, and it is this characteristic that he hoped with anticipation as did the annalists and writers of his age would usher in tranquility and order within the Kievan state. Jaroslav's *Testament* effectively undermined the principles of clan rule and established at least in theory the indivisibility of princely power.¹⁸⁰ In practice, however, his hope for orderly rule passing

¹⁷⁷ ПСРЛ 1: 161–162; *H*₁, 3: 181–182; *H*₄, 4: 117–118; *C*₁, 5: 137–139; *ПН*, 9: 86; *T*, 15: 151; *Л*, 20/1: 91; *X*, 22/1: 369; *ВЛ*, 30: 32; *НН*, 42: 65; and *Тр*, p. 140. Unlike *ПВЛ-Д*, *ПВЛ-И*, *ПСРЛ* 2: 149–151, does not designate Jaroslav as a "grand prince," but simply "prince;" so also *В*, 7: 332–333. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 142–143; and *БЛДР* 1: 202–203. On this, cf. Franklin, "Kievan Rus,'" p. 78. However, Franklin, *ibid.*, p. 84, holds that "Jaroslav's [*sic*] code is very brief, filling barely a page of a modern printed edition. It was chiefly concerned with discipline and disputes within the *druzhina* itself and the urban elite." Of significance are the studies of M. Dimnik, "The 'Testament' of Jaroslav 'the Wise': A Re-Examination," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 29 (1987): 369–386; Demidenko, pp. 288–296; and Shaikin, pp. 162–163.

¹⁷⁸ For aspects of this intellectual analysis, cf. the article of Nancy S. Kollmann, "Collateral Succession in Kievan Rus,'" *HUS* 14 (1990): esp. 377–381 and 384–385.

¹⁷⁹ ПСРЛ 1: 161; 2: 150; *H*₁, 3: 181–182; *H*₄, 4: 117; *C*₁, 5: 138–139; *В*, 7: 332–333; *ПН*, 9: 85–86; *T*, 15: 151–152; *X*, 22/1: 369–370; *НН*, 42: 65; and *Тр*, p. 140. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 142; and *БЛДР* 1: 202–203 and 510.

¹⁸⁰ Presniakov, *Княжеское право*, pp. 23 and 34–36; K. Fritzler, *Zwei Abhandlungen über altrussisches Recht* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1923), pp. 45 ff.; V.O. Kliuchevsky, *Курс русской истории*, 1 (Moscow, 1937): 97–100; Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, pp. 282 and 289; Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 83, 179, and 292 ff.; Soloviev, *История России*, 2: 343 ff.; and Poppe, *Państwo i kościół*, p. 251.

through generations of his descendants did not materialize. Upon his death, his sons, Izjaslav, Svjatoslav, and Vsevolod created the first of several triumvirates and thus negated their father's prescription for unified tranquil and orderly rule. Only the Christian annalists and writers hereafter steadfastly defended Jaroslav's legal tradition and obligation that the Kievan seat and its preeminence pass to the eldest prince within the immediate family.

There exists in the written sources a notable absence of commentary upon Jaroslav's shortcomings.¹⁸¹ Most glaring is the absence of a discussion of the primary weaknesses in Jaroslav's testamentary grant of princely power to his eldest son and his allocation of lesser towns among his other progeny. There is also the obvious failure to assign to any of them the more important commercial-military centers as Novgorod, Pskov, Rostov, Polotsk, and Tmutorokan'. Jaroslav's assignments may reflect a practical awareness that after 1037 Novgorod could no longer be regarded as dependent and subservient to the political and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Kiev, but had gained substantial autonomy in the governance of its secular and religious affairs.¹⁸² The fortified towns of Pskov, Rostov, Polotsk, and Tmutorokan' appear in this period to be in decline as important commercial-military centers or other complex factors had entered into the picture and Jaroslav saw no need in the *Testament* to assign these centers to his sons. Rather, he made allocations based on the contemporaneous commercial and military realities of his rule and the fact that he did not have a sufficient number of sons to assign

¹⁸¹ An obscure statement appears in the western Rus' *Stryjkovsky Chronicle* 5.1, relating that in 1015, Boris and Gleb, the favorites of Vladimir and the Rus' annalists, gathered armies against Jaroslav, although, if this is so, it was a failed attempt to march against him. This may provide some explanation for the inconsistencies encountered in the Rus' annals and their less than respected and credible treatment of Jaroslav. Cf. Tatischev, 2: 237, n. 213.

¹⁸² On the Novgorodian viewpoint regarding political and religious autonomy, as well as separatism, cf. W.K. Hanak, "New Introduction," in *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471*, trans. R. Michell and N. Forbes (repr., Hattiesburg, 1970), pp. xlv ff. The theme of northern separatism and of two Rus' entities in the ninth to the eleventh centuries with substantive textual citation is further explored by M.M. Aleksandrov, *Русские земли-княжества IX-XV веков: компаративистский анализ культурно-политических альтернатив*. Российский Научно-Исследовательский Институт Природного и Культурного Наследия имени Д. С. Лихачева (Moscow, 2009), pp. 12–43. Further on the complexities and variations in the interpretations of this issue, cf. M. Dimnik, "The Nature of Princely Rule in Novgorod from 970 to 1136," *MS* 72 (2010): esp. 136–140. In addition, applying an archaeological approach to evaluate the role of the formal Christianization under Vladimir I and the earlier presence (ninth century) of Christianity in the Novgorod region, cf. A.E. Musin, *Христианизация новгородской земли в IX-XIV веках. Погребальный обряд и христианские древности* (St. Petersburg, 2002), esp. chs. 2, 6, and 7, with extensive annotations and bibliography for each chapter.

to all centers, thus making his appointments to those that he regarded as the most important at that moment. Kievan interests had indeed shifted from the unstable southeast to the more secure northwest and west.

The early Rus' annalists and writers were conscious of the similarities between their political construction and those of the ancient Hebrew tribes. Rus' reflections upon Old Testament kingship and the comparable qualities and characteristics of rulership noted in the princely powers of Vladimir, Mstislav, and Jaroslav¹⁸³ fostered an image that occasionally was not in consonance with reality. Nevertheless, the ancient Hebrew accounts became a suitable vehicle for developing and expressing a Kievan historiographic tradition of princely power. At the same time, the early Rus' scribes could not overlook the impact that Christianity adopted from Byzantium had upon their notions of rulership and the role of their prince within the community of Christian rulers.

¹⁸³ Striking is *R*'s treatment of Vladimir in Degree One and Jaroslav in Degree Two. Degree One devotes pp. 58–148 to Vladimir, whereas Degree Two skimps and awards only pp. 168–171 to Jaroslav. There remains the suspicion in reading these numerous annals and other works that Jaroslav, aside for the praise of his love of books and church and monastery building, was not held in high esteem by the contemporaneous scribes, very much unlike the applause given to his father Vladimir especially for his achievement, the Christianization of Kievan Rus'. *R*'s treatment of Jaroslav may very well be a summary of the degree of condescension that the annalists and other writers accorded to him and preserved in the various redacted texts over the centuries. We could further speculate on the reasons for demeaning Jaroslav, or lessening descriptions of his rule, perhaps because of his physical shortcomings, being partially lame according to some traditions, and therefore he was not a factor in personal combat, since he personally did not participate in any great military feats and none are attributed to him. Too, Jaroslav had had strong links with Scandinavia, especially during the decades when he was prince of Novgorod, which he maintained even during his years as the Kievan prince. As well, his marriage to Ingigerd, a daughter of the king of Sweden, complicated his relations with the pro-Byzantine Rus' scribes, who could not ignore the religious Latinization process occurring in Scandinavia. Cf. H.R.E. Davidson, *The Viking Road to Byzantium* (London, 1976), pp. 158–173; and H. Birnbaum, "Jaroslav's Varangian Connection," *S-S* 24 (1978): 5–25.

CHAPTER TWO

BYZANTINE IMPERIAL THOUGHT IN THEORY AND PRACTICE IN VLADIMIRIAN-JAROSLAVIAN RUS'

The formal reception of Eastern Christianity from Byzantium expose Kievan Rus' to a political and cultural efflorescence. Christianity, the Rus' annalists and literary apologists believed, had effaced the primitive Kievan Rus' political traditions and pagan religious legacy. But the transition from old customs and practices to new currents was difficult and not abrupt in spite of princely dictates. A major difficulty explaining this problematic transition was the relationship of the primary Kievan prince to the Byzantine *autokrator* (ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ) whose authority was formulated through his autonomous powers and monarchy, and not in a military framework, although there are exceptions to this and some East Roman rulers clearly obtained their office through military means. Early Rus' and the contemporaneous Byzantine sources do not define the precise nature of their relationship nor do these same works explain the role played by the Kievan princes within the community of Christian rulers at whose head sat the Byzantine emperor. The nature of Kievan Rus' princely power, a consequence of Byzantine political and religious influences, did undergo some alteration, but the image of the Kievan prince is not always clear and demonstrates in the early Rus' textual tradition an unwillingness to admit an inclusive, but rather only a partial dependence upon Byzantine imperial theory and practice.

Byzantine imperial thought has its foundation in the Greco-Roman notions of the powers of the *basileus* and *autokrator*. The term *basileus* with its Hellenistic roots is synonymous with the ancient Greek designation for king and conceives the ruler as the embodiment of the law incarnate and his supreme political authority as the terrestrial mirror of divine wisdom and power. The notion of the *basileus* was in time gradually infused by Byzantine ecclesiastical writers with a Christian interpolation and the *basileus* assumed the likeness of God's vicar on earth. The distinction of *autokrator* corresponds to the Latin *imperator* (emperor)¹ and Father Fran-

¹ For more extensive discussion of these terms, cf. J.B. Bury, *The Constitution of the*

cis Dvornik correctly concludes: “the Byzantine rulers were Roman emperors, conscious of the historical source of their power and of their duties to every province”² These titled distinctions had some impact upon the course of the empire’s relations with its neighbors³ and the dual usage of these distinctions posed little difficulties for Byzantine imperial theoreticians. Further, the idea of the supremacy of monarchic power as exemplified in the Byzantine coronation ceremony performed for each new emperor became deeply rooted in political practice. The Byzantines incorporated the notion of the dual aspects of the terrestrial image of the power of God and of the emperor being the anointed of this heavenly being. The *basileus* thus emerged as the representative of God on earth and this notion fortified the imperial power of the *basileus*.⁴

On the other hand, the lawfully appointed *autokrator* was at the same time conferred with two supplementary powers. First, he was the heir to the notion of a universal emperor who exercised absolute and unlimited powers in the regulation of human matters that were essential for the preservation of an ordered society. But conjointly and equally, he was as well the universal representative of Christendom in the regulation of divine matters. Other Christian princes could be regarded as deputies of the sole legitimate Byzantine emperor. Those territories, as the littoral of the Pontic steppe that had been in the past under the dominion of the ancient Greeks and later under the Byzantines, but were now occupied and ruled by a newly Christianized people—the Kievan Rus’—perhaps those lands could again be restored to the political and religious sovereignty of the emperors at Constantinople and become coextensive with the one universal Christian empire. The

Later Roman Empire: Creighton Memorial Lecture Delivered at University College, London, 12 November, 1909 (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 19–21; and G. Ostrogorsky, “Автократор и Самодржац,” *SKA* 164 (1935): 97–121. Also M. McCormick, “Autokrator,” in *ODB* 1: 235.

² Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*, 2: 839, and *passim*, for a discussion of the historical roots of Byzantine imperial powers. Other essential works for a study of these powers include G. Ostrogorsky, “Отношение церкви и государства в Bizантии,” *SK* 4 (1931): 121–134; and reprinted in Serbian under the title: “Однос цркве и државе у Византији,” in *idem*, *О веровањима и схватањима византинца, Сабрана дела Георгија Острогорског* 5 (Belgrade, 1970): 224–237; F. Dölger, “Die Kaiserurkunden der Byzantiner als Ausdruck ihrer politischen Anschauungen,” *HZ* 159 (1938–1939): 229–250; and G. Ostrogorsky, “The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order,” *SEER* 35/84 (1956): 1–14.

³ For relations with Kievan Rus’, cf. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 164–201, esp. 181–200, and 223–229.

⁴ Cf. P. Charanis, “Coronation and Its Constitutional Significance in the Later Roman Empire,” *Byz* 15 (1940–1941): 49–66.

Byzantine emperor Basil I (867–886) had attempted to introduce these dual ideas of universal emperor and of universal representative of Christendom in a law book, the *Ἐπαναγωγή* (*Epanagoge*),⁵ which he commissioned, but to which he did not affix his *imprimatur*. Basil adhered to the notion of a Byzantine Commonwealth in which Christian princes had a role and as Obolensky stresses: "... each nation was theoretically assigned its particular place, according to the excellence of its culture, the degree of political independence enjoyed by its ruler, the military resources he commanded and the services he and his subjects could render to the empire."⁶ The place of each nation is well exemplified in the *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*,⁷ a tenth-century work authored by Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, wherein each nation is accorded its proper station according to the model illustrated by Obolensky. And the Hellenistic-Roman-Christian formulations on the God-established powers of the *basileus* and *autokrator* in the God-protected city of Constantinople encouraged the tenth- and eleventh-century Byzantine apologists to continue the notion of the universal sovereignty of the emperor and to claim that the Kievan Rus' occupied a subordinate position within the commonwealth without elucidating whether this was both a political and religious union or simply the latter, although we should assume that it included both since church and state were very much intertwined in the conduct of their affairs.⁸ Whether the Byzantines claimed this

⁵ *Epanagoge*, ed. K.E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, in *Collectio librorum iuris graeco-romani Eclogam Leonis et Constantini, Epanagogen Basilii Leonis et Alexandri continens* (Leipzig, 1852), pp. 53–217; and *Jus graeco-romanum*, eds. J. and P. Zepos, 2 (Athens, 1931): 229–368 and 410–427. Paradoxically, the *Epanagoge* appears to have had no influence in the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian period until its introduction in fourteenth-century Muscovite Rus', and any efforts to link it to the earlier period of Kievan Rus' history would be highly speculative. For a more recent discussion with bibliography on the *Ἐπαναγωγή*, cf. A. Schminck, "Epanagoge," *ODB* 1: 703–704.

⁶ D. Obolensky, "Russia's Byzantine Heritage," *OSP* 1 (1950): 56; and *idem*, "The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy," *Actes du Congrès international des études byzantines, XII^e Congrès* 1 (Belgrade, 1963): 53. Cf. *Collectio librorum*, p. 68 and iii. Cap. 8. Parenthetically, these qualifications as elucidated by Obolensky, in retrospect, fit better under Jaroslav than his father Vladimir, perhaps admitting the stability that Rus' had achieved at this later stage.

⁷ Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae* (Reiske edition); and *Le livre des ceremonies* (Vogt edition).

⁸ E. Barker, ed. and trans., *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 89 ff.; and Obolensky, "Principles and Methods," p. 52. Cf. V. Val'denberg, *Древнерусскія ученія о предѣлахъ царской власти. Очерки русской политической литературы отъ Владимира Святого до конца XVII вѣка* (Petrograd, 1916), pp. 80–81, who does not admit the presence in Kievan Rus' of factual manifestations of imperial power following the baptism of Vladimir.

subordinate status on the excellence of Rus' culture now inherited through their Christianization, on the internal political status of their leading princes, on Kievan military strength, and on other services the Rus' might furnish to the emperor, it is apparent from our discussion in the previous chapter that these were factors in their considerations. While the Byzantines were conscious of the historical antecedents of their imperial powers, their application of these theoretical speculations to imperial relations with the Rus' princes from Vladimir to Jaroslav met with occasional resistance, as we shall subsequently notice.

But the place of the Kievan state within the conceptual framework of a universal Christian empire remains difficult to discern. Vladimir accepted conversion under circumstances that admit neither political nor religious dependence. Rather, diplomatic advantage and the enhancement of the prince's position *vis-à-vis* neighboring rulers was a primary concern.⁹ Two distinct traditions emerge in *ПѢА* when recounting his baptism. First, the Kievan prince recognized the inadequacies of the Varangian-Slavic pagan deities with all their implications of primitivism and he sought through the adoption of a new state religion to elevate the stature of Kievan Rus' in its foreign political and commercial relations. The initial impression that is conveyed is that Vladimir through his own initiative and with the advice and consent of the boyars and town-elders received religious emissaries from the Muslim Volga Bulgars, the Christian Germans, the Jewish Khazars, and the Byzantines.¹⁰ In retelling this account (a number of modern scholars adhere to the notion that this account was an addition to a later rendition of the annal), *ПѢА* makes no suggestion of Vladimir's willingness to subordinate the political and religious rights of his subjects to a foreign temporal and ecclesiastical authority. On the contrary, the narrative implies the predominant theme that these religious missions were accepted as a result of the actions of the Kievan prince and of his own volition. It follows that Vladimir had no desire to diminish his personal authority and to subordinate his office to a higher-ranking foreign ruler.

The second *ПѢА* tradition, recounting the urgent need of the Byzantine emperor Basil II for foreign military reinforcements against a domestic

⁹ Cf. A. Vasiliev, "Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?," *Sp* 7 (1932): 350, who states that Vladimir's principality was "... politically absolutely independent of Byzantium." His assertion at first sight does not appear convincing and should only be accepted with some modifications, lessening its harsh tone and implications.

¹⁰ *ИСРЛ* 1: 84–106; and 2: 71–92. Cf. *РРСЛ*, pp. 96–110; and *БЛДР* 1: 132–153. Cf. *supra*, pp. 24–27 and nn. 51–55.

rival, should not be understood as an independent narration explaining Vladimir's conversion to Christianity, but as an event that was coincidental to the reception of religious missions and a study of their respective religious beliefs and practices. As we have previously noted in the preceding chapter, a civil-military rebellion in Asia Minor in 986 incited by Bardas Skleros posed a threat to Basil's continued rule. Seeking allies to support and replenish his forces, the emperor initially called upon an old rival and antagonist, the general Bardas Phokas. By September of the following year, Phokas had put down the revolt, but with his newfound strength he decided to exercise his own pretensions to the imperial throne and proclaimed himself emperor. Basil now turned to the Rus' ambassadors in Constantinople to prevail upon their prince for the dispatch of military forces. Vladimir seized the moment, recognizing an opportunity for diplomatic advantage, and negotiated an agreement with Basil.¹¹ The Kievan prince offered to furnish 6,000 warriors and in return he asked for the hand in marriage of the porphyrogenete imperial princess Anna. Heretofore, except on rare occasions, the Byzantine emperors had been unwilling to make such marital concessions, neither to foreign Christian nor to pagan rulers, because of the royal and palace birth of such high princesses. *ПВЛ*, however, attributes Vladimir's baptism to his desire to marry Anna¹² and, while a Byzantine source confirms conversion as a requisite for their wedding,¹³ it is probable that the Kievan prince had demonstrated his own initiative in the matter and had earlier become a Christian. In his *A Eulogy and Praise*, Jakob, more contemporary to the events associated with Vladimir's rule than *ПВЛ* or other Rus' annals disputes the year of his conversion and recalls that the "grand prince" took Kherson in the third year of his Christianization. This would fix the year of his baptism to 987.¹⁴

By early 989, however, the revolt of Bardas Phokas had been suppressed, aside from some sporadic fighting in the provinces. Having in the meantime

¹¹ Leon Diakonos, pp. 171 ff. (x.10); and *ПСРЛ* 1: 109 ff.; and 2: 94 ff. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 111–113; and *БЛДР* 1: 154 ff. For a critical study of the military-marital negotiations of 988, cf. Vasil'evsky, *Труды*, 1: 196 ff.; and 2: 62 ff.; and G. Ostrogorsky, "Владимир Святой и Византия," in *Владимирский Сборник в память 950-летия крещения Руси, 988–1938* (Belgrade, 1938), pp. 31–40; repr. in Serbian, "Кијевски кнез 950-летия крещения Руси, 988–1938," in *idem, Византија и Словени, Сабрана дела Георгија Острогорског* 4 (Belgrade, 1970): 137–146.

¹² *ПСРЛ* 1: 110; and 2: 95. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 112; and *БЛДР* 1: 154–155.

¹³ F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches (Corpus des griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit)*, 1 (Munich and Berlin, 1924): no. 776.

¹⁴ Makarii, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1: 263; and Golubinsky, 1: 244.

disposed of his rivals and safeguarded his throne, Basil, although he had given his formal approval for the marriage,¹⁵ began in the previous few months to retreat from his consent. The Kievan prince became anxious at the dilatoriness of the emperor and even suspected Byzantine duplicity in the matter, although Anna herself may have contributed to the dilatory actions of her brother because of her reluctance to marry Vladimir, whom she regarded as a barbarian (a foreigner with primitive connotations), but more so because of her apparent knowledge of his numerous wives and extensive concubines. She was sufficiently headstrong to reject the notion of becoming one of many women about Vladimir. And when Anna failed to appear upon the southern shores of Kievan Rus', Vladimir launched an attack against the Greek commercial center of Kherson, one of the few remaining Byzantine cities of prominence on the northern Pontic littoral. The attack commenced in the autumn of 988 and the city fell before his armies the following spring. Only now did Basil admit the strength of Rus' military resources and recognize the political self-determination of Vladimir as a ruler and as a foe determined to preserve the inviolableness of their accord. With the loss of Kherson, Basil now realized the will of Vladimir and urged his sister for reasons of state and Christianity to consent to the marriage. He also feared continued Rus' attacks upon the interests of the empire.¹⁶ With great reluctance she agreed to journey to Kherson where her marriage to Vladimir was solemnized.

The two conversion traditions do not in themselves denote either political or religious dependence, unless by prior arrangement an inferior status is accepted. To restate what had been previously noted in this study, Vladimir's primary motive to become a Christian, aside from the pro-Byzantine proclivities of the *ПРА* compilers in favor of Greek teachings and liturgies, was to improve the standing of his principality in its relations with more advanced neighboring states. Although no direct and conclusive evidence is available, it appears in view of Kiev's extensive commercial relations with Constantinople and Byzantine possessions that such considerations as the degree of ceremonial embellishment accorded as suitable by the Greeks during the reception of Rus' ambassadors at the imperial court would not go unnoticed. There exists a valid suspicion that Vladimir was aware of Kiev's inferior ranking relative to other states in the Byzantine ordering of nations.

¹⁵ Dölger, *Regesten*, 1: no. 777.

¹⁶ *ИСРП* 1: 110–111; and 2: 96. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 112–113; and *БЛДП* 1: 160–161.

Beside the *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae* that had established a system of grading all rulers in a hierarchy and of determining their place in this organization by the degree of affinity to the *autokrator* and by the award of Byzantine court titles to them, Constantine Porphyrogenetos had initially fixed their relative degree of importance and their position in his *De Administrando Imperio*,¹⁷ a treatise on imperial statecraft. This system of imperial organization created the fiction of a world government in which kings and princes were subordinated to the supremacy of the Byzantine emperor. If Vladimir was aware that Kievan Rus' occupied an inferior position in the Byzantine ordering of nations, his conversion to Christianity and his marriage to Anna doubtlessly could at once elevate his nation's standing. But in seeking to improve the relative place of his principality, did Vladimir also alter the nature of his princely powers and accept a title implying a subordinate rank in the *autokrator's* hierarchy of dependent rulers?

PBA without hesitation appears to discount the notion of political and perhaps even of religious subordination from the onset of Vladimir's Christian rule. At the same time this work is imprecise in discussing any alterations in the character of his political powers. The annal records on the occasion of the prince's capture of Kherson and in fulfillment of the marriage contract that Basil had only asked of Vladimir that *и съ нами единъ вѣрникъ будешнъ* "he be one with us in faith."¹⁸ The *Книга Степенная Царского Родословия*, *The Book of Ranks of Tsarist Genealogy* (also translated as *The Book of Royal Degrees*), while reflecting a sixteenth-century Muscovite historiographic tradition that sought to link Muscovite Rus' with Byzantium and to establish the notion of Moscow as the Third Rome, provides a more persuasive statement on the conditions that were set forth and led to Vladimir's betrothal to Anna:¹⁹

НЕ ДОСТОИТЬ ХРИСТИАНОМЪ ЗА ПОГАНЬНА ДАВАТИ, НО АЩЕ ХОЩЕШИ, ДА КРЕСТИШСЯ И НАШЪ ЗАКОНЪ ГРЕЧЕСКІЙ ПРИМЕШИ И СЪ НАМИ ЕДИНОВѢРЕНЪ И ЕДИНОМЫСЛЕНЪ ВО БЛАГОЧЕСТИИ БУДЕШИ И СВОЙСТВЕНЮЮ ЛЮБОВЬ ПОКАЖЕШИ НАМЪ

It is not fitting to give a Christian to a pagan, but if you wish, be baptized and receive our Greek law and be one with us in faith and one in thought. For in being devout you show us in this way your love

¹⁷ Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Administrando Imperio* (Moravcsik). Cf. vol. 2: *Commentary*, eds. R.J.H. Jenkins, et al. (London, 1962): 93–101.

¹⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 110; and 2: 95. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 112; and *БЛДР* 1: 154–155. Cf. *supra*, p. 27 and n. 56.

¹⁹ *К, ПСРЛ* 21/1: 93. For the manuscript history and sources, cf. the various articles in *The Book of Royal Degrees and the Genesis of Russian Historical Consciousness*, eds. Gail Lenhoff and Ann Kleimola, UCLA Slavic Studies, n.s., 7 (Bloomington, IN, 2011): 3–93.

Vladimir's reply contains a tacit acceptance of the baptismal conditions, but *The Book of Ranks of Tsarist Genealogy* includes no admission that the Kievan prince would assent to receive and adopt Greek secular law for his land.²⁰ And no such admission is evident for religious decrees. Basil appears to have adopted the view that whosoever received Christianity from the empire is henceforth a part of the imperial commonwealth of which he is the primary sovereign and the new proselyte must submit himself to the purview of Byzantine laws.²¹

These provisions were not new and had been factors three decades earlier in Kievan Rus' during the regency of Vladimir's grandmother Olga. First, *ПБД* relates extensively that the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos on the occasion of her visit to Constantinople had expressed a desire to marry the widow Olga.²² This annalistic claim is without foundation, for in Byzantine sources there is no evidence that the emperor desired to leave his wife for Olga. She was aware of this and tricked him by having the emperor stand as her "Godfather" at her baptism in Constantinople and then brought the fact to his attention that according to Christian law a godfather cannot marry a female that he had sponsored, that is, he cannot marry his godchild. This embellished account appears to be based on legends since the Rus' scribes were uncertain decades or even centuries later when and where her baptism had actually taken place.

Concerning the question of adopting Byzantine laws, Olga must have been well aware that Varangian-Slavic political and pagan elements were most powerful in her court and without their consent and support she could not introduce Byzantine Christianity into her state. Her conversion was a personal response and she could only pray that others would follow in her course. Her visit to Constantinople did produce a positive result. Sacred books containing ecclesiastical and secular laws and priests now appear in increased numbers in Kievan Rus'. But her visit and adoption of Byzantine learning hastened her political ruin. Strong anti-Christian elements in her court feared a diminution in their influence, power, and prestige if Christianity were allowed to flourish and to supplant their brand of paganism. And when Olga repeatedly prevailed upon her son Svjatoslav to accept the

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 93–94.

²¹ F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism: History and Legend* (Cambridge, 1948), pp. 115 ff.

²² *ИСПИ* 1: 60–63; and 2: 49–51. Cf. *RPCLT*, 82–84; and *БЛДП* 1: 110–111. Cf. *supra*, pp. 11–12, n. 18.

new faith, their apprehensions multiplied. *ПВЛ* relates that on one occasion Olga asked Svjatoslav to undertake a personal conversion and he responded to her exhortation:²³

КАКО АЗЪ ХОЧЮ ННЪ ЗАКОНЪ ПРИАТИ ЕДИНЪ· А ДРУЖИНА [МОА] СЕМУ СМѢАТИСѦ
НАЧИНУТЬ·

How shall I alone wish to accept another law, when [my] retinue will begin to ridicule this?

The term *ЗАКОНЪ* has a double application. It can be construed as either law, *ὁ νόμος*, with the implication that it is divinely inspired, or faith, *ὁ λόγος*, a verbal noun perhaps also implying a statement of an argument. More often than not, Slavs who wished to accept conversion to Byzantine Christianity requested the law as is evidenced in the sources. But from the Rus' perspective, *ЗАКОНЪ* carried the implication that should Svjatoslav consent to baptism, he in effect would negate his nation's religious practices and as well secular laws, acknowledging that Byzantine civil and religious laws were paramount within his own principality. The earlier appearance in Bulgaria of Slavonic translations of the *Ἐκλογὴ τῶν νόμων* (*Ecloga, A Selection of Laws*), a handbook of eighteen abridged Roman and Byzantine laws prescribing legal norms for daily life, including legislation regulating guilds and trade;²⁴

²³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 63; and 2: 52, that reads slightly different: КАКО АЗЪ ХОЧЮ ННЪ ЗАКОНЪ. ШДИНЪ
КАЗЪ ПРИНАТИ. А ДРУЖИНА МОА СЕМУ СМѢАТИ НАЧНУ; however, *H*, 3: 116, reads: КАКО АЗЪ ХОЩУ
ННЪ ЗАКОНЪ ПРИНАТИ ЕДИНЪ, А ДРУЖИНА СМѢАТИСѦ НАЧНУТЬ И РУГАТИСѦ; *H*, 4: 44, emends that
latter phrase to read: А ДРУЖИНА СЕМОУ СМѢАТИСѦ НАЧНОУТЬ; so also an emendation in *G*, 5: 106,
reading: КАКО АЗЪ ХОЩЮ ЕДИНУ ННЪ ЗАКОНЪ ПРИАТИ? А ДРУЖИНА МОА СМѢАТИСѦ НАЧНУТЬ; *L*, 7:
287, reads as *G*; *ПН*, 9: 30, reads as *H*; *T*, 15: 64, and *НК*, 42: 38, read as *G*; and *K*, 21/1: 20–21,
does not retain this statement, but has an extended variant text on the dialogue between
his mother Olga and himself. The passage does not appear in *ВЛ*, 30: 21, and the focus of the
entry centers on Olga's dialogue with the emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos. *ННК*, 1:
57, translates the passage as follows: "How can I accept another faith? My warriors will laugh
at it and be angry." This passage reads similar to *H*, *Тр*, p. 84, reads as *H*. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 83–84;
and *БЛДР* 1: 112–113. The passage is excised from *П*. Shaikin, p. 81, interprets this statement to
be a commonplace in early medieval texts.

²⁴ Editions of this work appear in Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Collectio librorum*, pp. 1–
52; Zepos, 2: 1–62; C.A. Spulber, *L'Eclogue des Isauriens* (Cernauti, 1929); E.H. Freshfield,
trans., *A Manual of Roman Law: the Ecloga Published by Emperors Leo III and Constantine V
of Isauria at Constantinople A.D. 726* (Cambridge, 1926). An Old Church Slavonic translation
appears in Patriarch Nikon's *Кормчии книга* (1st ed., Moscow, 1650). Cf. *Еклога. Византий-
ский законодательный свод VIII века*, ed. Elena E. Lipshits (Moscow, 1965), text: pp. 41–76,
and commentary follows. The Lipshits volume was retranslated and substantially expanded
with additional commentary by M.Ia. Siuziumov, *Еклога: Византийский законодательный
свод VIII века* (Riazan, 2006). A passage from the "Preface" to the *Ἐκλογὴ* appears in Barker,

of the *Νομοκάνων* (*Nomokanon*), a collection of secular laws (*οἱ νόμοι*) and ecclesiastical rules (*οἱ κανόνες*), previously attributed to the sixth-century patriarch of Constantinople, John Scholastikos, but since scholarly thinking has made other attributions for its origins and textual expansions;²⁵ of chronicles and other works within several decades after the conversion of the Bulgars in the mid-860s to Byzantine Christianity, probably reinforced Varangian-Slavic suspicions of Byzantine political and religious policies and that a similar process would take hold in Kievan Rus'. It should be understood that in practice neither the Byzantines, Varangian and Slavic Rus', Southern, Eastern, or Western Slavs delimited the spheres of church and state legal jurisdiction. Often the heads of state took the initiative to issue laws of a purely religious nature, while the religious leadership sought to enforce rules in secular matters. The pagan majority in Svjatoslav's court well understood the implications of his acceptance of Christianity and they impressed upon him the importance of safeguarding their ancient political and religious principles and practices from foreign corruption. *The Book of Ranks of Tsarist Genealogy* admits the attempted application of this civil and religious legal tradition during Basil II's reign, but this book and the earlier *ΠΒΙ* demonstrate that Vladimir, perhaps recalling his grandmother's experiences and his father's reactions to them, or at least profiting from

pp. 84–85. For a recent and significant interpretative examination of the essential secondary literature relative to the *Ecloga*, cf. L.V. Milov, *Исследования по истории памятников средневекового права* (Moscow, 2009), *passim*.

²⁵ On this, most recently, cf. A. Schminck, "Nomokanones" and "Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles," *ODB* 3: 1491. For older printed literature on the *Nomocanon XIV titulorum*, cf. *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteria ...*, eds. G. Voellius and H. Iustellius, 2 (Paris, 1661): 785–1140; *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, ed. J.B. Pitra, 2 (Rome, 1868): 433–637; and G.A. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα των Θείων καὶ κανόνων κτλ.*, 1 (Athens, 1852): 1–335. Note also the Church Slavonic editions in Nikon; V.N. Beneshevich, *Канонический сборник XIV титуловъ со второй четверти VII вѣка до 883 г.* (St. Petersburg, 1905; repr. SB 2a [Leipzig, 1974]); *idem*, *Древне-славянская кормчая XIV титуловъ без толковании*, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1906; repr. Sofia, 1987); and *idem*, *Syntagma XIV titulorum sine scholiis secundum versionem paleo-slovenicam ...*, 1, SB 2b (Leipzig, 1974). Cf. *Nomocanon L. titulorum*, in Voellius, 2: 603–660; V.N. Beneshevich, *Синагога въ 50 титуловъ и другіе юридическіе сборники Иоанна Схоластика. Къ древнѣйшей исторіи источниковъ права греко-восточной церкви* (St. Petersburg, 1914); and *idem*, *Joannis Scholastici sinagoga L titulorum ceteraque eiusdem opera iuridica*. ABAW, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Neue Folge, Heft 14., 1 (Munich, 1937). The Slavonic manuscripts of the *Νομοκάνων* and their contents are studied by T. Mitrovits, *Nomokanon der slavischen Morgenländischen Kirche oder der Kormtschja Kniga* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1898); and P.I. Žužek, *Kormčaja Kniga: Studies on the Chief Code of Russian Canon Law*, OCA 168 (Rome, 1964): 14–51 and 64–101.

them, achieved Christianization without surrendering his sovereignty and without relinquishing the guarantees of his principality's integrity and independence.

The only notable but solitary exception during Vladimir's rule where Byzantine law had some appreciable influence upon the Kievan prince, and an admission is so made in the sources, occurred on the occasion of his dedication of the Church of the Blessed Virgin of the Tithes (*ДЕСЯТИННАЯ*) on 12 May 996.²⁶ Concomitant with the dedication ceremony, Vladimir issued his *УСТАВЪ СВЯТАГО КНЯЗЯ ВОЛОДИМЕРА. КРЕСТИВШАГО РУССКУЮ ЗЕМЛЮ. О ЦЕРКОВНЫХЪ СУДЕХЪ И О ДЕСЯТИНАХЪ* (*The Statute of Prince Vladimir the Saint, the Baptizer of the Rus' Land, Concerning Ecclesiastical Justice and Regarding Tithes*).²⁷ The *Statute* records that Vladimir opened the *Νομοκάνων*, that is to

²⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 124; and 2: 108–109. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 120–121; and *БЛДР* 1: 168–169 and 505–506.

²⁷ As is apparent, the label for the document is post-Vladimirian because it identifies him as a saint. He was awarded sainthood upon his death in 1015 at the time of internment and the Kievan religious hierarchy proclaimed him a saint at that moment as was then customary within the Byzantine and Roman churches. It was only later that the churches created a more formalized procedure for granting sainthood. The Byzantine patriarchate, however, disputed this designation and refused recognition of sainthood until much later and even then rather reluctantly. There are two possible explanations for their stance. First, legend claims that Vladimir, perhaps disappointed with his marriage to Anna, or because of her age, was unfaithful to her. How true this is is subject to scholarly disputation and may be nothing more than a survival of courtly gossip, seeking to denigrate him. The Byzantine court may have been aware of his infidelity and disapproved of his actions, understandably showing their bias toward Anna. Second, the Byzantine patriarchate may have claimed jurisdiction for conferring sainthood and believed that the Kievan church had exceeded its authority and was subordinate to that of the patriarchate in such matters.

Further on the question of when Vladimir was awarded sainthood, there exists a vast secondary literature that is beyond the scope of this study to submit to an intensive analysis. Most recently, cf. J. Korpela, *Prince, Saint and Apostle: Prince Vladimir Svjatoslavič of Kiev, His Posthumous Life, and the Religious Legitimization of the Russian Great Power*, Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institut München. Reihe Geschichte 67 (Wiesbaden, 2001), pp. 180–206, who addresses this substantial literature. More limited in approach is the essay of C.J. Halperin and Ann M. Kleimola, "Visual Evidence of the Cult of St. Vladimir," *Die Welt der Slaven* 51 (2006): 253–274, who raise a number of contentious questions and demonstrate an unawareness of the Byzantine sainthood process. Byzantine canonical and liturgical practices differ, even to the present, from the Latin Rite and the authors prefer to equate Vladimir's "canonization" with western practices. Until the thirteenth century there was neither in the Latin nor the Byzantine Rite a formalized procedure for pronouncing sainthood. The prevalent practice was to declare an individual in a religious ceremony a saint upon internment. Had they compared the conference of sainthood upon Boris and Gleb and when this occurred (most probably soon after their deaths in 1015), they might have arrived at a different conclusion. Given the emphasis in this article upon visual evidence, that is mainly icons and other visual expressions, the surviving works pair Vladimir with his sons Boris and Gleb. We should

say the *Νομοκάνων* of John Scholastikos,²⁸ the assumption being that he could read a Greek rendition or a Church Slavonic translation, to ascertain the respective spheres of lay and ecclesiastical juridical jurisdiction. This church statute stipulates that neither the prince, nor his nobles, nor lay judges might interfere in matters falling within the competence of ecclesiastical courts. The prince of Kiev by implication admitted the proper relationship within his Christian state between the secular power and spiritual authority, but by merely consulting the *Νομοκάνων* Vladimir minimized its overall impact upon the Rus' and refused to grant it an overriding position within his principality. Neither the *Statute* nor any other sources hold that Vladimir adhered to the notion of the subordination of the prevailing interests of the state to those of the church.²⁹

The oldest extant manuscript of the *Statute* dates to the thirteenth century and later redactions may include accretions submitted by subsequent

interpret this as recognition that all three had been granted sainthood. When this depiction first appeared is unclear because of a paucity of icons and other artistic depictions prior to the thirteenth century. Further Halperin and Kleimola make no reference to *The Statute of Vladimir the Saint*, which predates the surviving visual depictions and as is apparent labels Vladimir a saint.

The most recent and complete collection of Vladimir's *Statute* was published by the Russian Archeographic Commission, *Уставъ святаго великаго князя Владимира о церковныхъ судахъ и о десятинахъ*, ed. V.N. Beneshevich (Petrograd, 1915). This edition was later reissued by the same commission and slightly expanded under the same editor, and retitled: *Памятники древне-русского канонического права*, Part 2, no. 1, РИБ 36 (Petrograd, 1920): 1–72. For other textual editions and critical works, cf. Makarii, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1: 257 ff.; L.K. Goetz, *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichte Denkmäler Altrusslands, nebst Geschichte des russischen Kirchenrechts* (Stuttgart, 1905), pp. 12–39 (texts: pp. 14–18); V.N. Beneshevich, *Сборникъ памятниковъ по исторіи церковнаго права*, 1 (Petrograd, 1914): 59–77; S.V. Iushkov, *Уставъ кн. Владимира. (Историко-юридическое изслѣдованіе). Изслѣдованія по исторіи Русского права*, Саратовское Общество, исторіи, археологіи, и этнографіи, no. 1. (п.р., n.d.): 21–27; *idem*, *Уставъ князя Владимира* (Novouzensk, 1926); *Памятники русского права*, ed. A.A. Zimin, 1 (Moscow, 1952): 237–246; Benz, pp. 40–41; *Хрестоматія по исторіи СССР, с древнейших времен до конца XV века*, ed. M.N. Tikhomirov (Moscow, 1960), pp. 192–194; M. Szeffel and A. Eck, *Documents de droit public relatifs à la Russie médiévale* (Bruxelles, 1963), pp. 229–238; and an English translation that appears in G. Vernadsky, “The Status of the Russian Church,” *SEER* 20 (1941): 306. *ПСРЛ* 6: 82–84; and *Льготный сборникъ именуемю льготисью Авраамки*, in *ПСРЛ* 16 (St. Petersburg, 1889): 265–266, contain additional versions of the *Statute*. For a further comprehensive bibliography of the *Statute*, cf. Nikol'sky, *Материалы*, pp. 59–71; M.A. D'iakonov, *Очерки общественнаго и государственнаго строя Древней Руси* (4th ed. rev. and enlarged, Moscow, 1926), pp. 29–31; Iushkov, *Общественно-политический строй*, pp. 191–211; and Ia. N. Shchapov, *Княжескіе уставы и церковь в древней Руси XI–XIV вв.* (Moscow, 1972), pp. 12 ff.

²⁸ On this, cf. V.A. Semenovker, *Библиографические памятники в Византии* (Moscow, 1995), esp. 145–152.

²⁹ On the relationship of church and state, cf. Podskalsky, p. 36 f. and *passim*.

copyists who incorporated distortions foreign to the original text. In some aspects, the later redactions of the *Statute* preserve the language of the initial version, but in other respects they also improve upon it.

The introduction of the tithe system as an essential source of revenue for the Church of the Blessed Virgin of the Tithe was alien to Byzantine ecclesiastical canon law and is more common to Western European, that is, Frankish practices. Through his church statute Vladimir may have been willing to admit the competence of the *Νομοκάνων* as a standard for certain Rus' religious customs and traditions that were also generally common to the Greeks. But it may be that the Kievan prince was most reluctant to admit complete dependence upon this Byzantine church law.³⁰ He was willing to concede the immunity of Rus' ecclesiastical courts from the interference of secular domination as prescribed in the *Νομοκάνων*. To demonstrate that in religious matters there was no authority above his own, he adopted the tithe system as a counterbalance to Byzantine ecclesiastical pretensions. For all intents and purposes, then, Vladimir by virtue of his princely authority over his principality asserted his right to the same powers that the Byzantine emperors claimed to enjoy over the empire and the church,³¹ that is, the right to employ constraint to enforce secular and ecclesiastical laws.

In the introduction to the *УСТАВЪ ВЕЛИКАГО КНЯЗЯ ЯРРОСЛАВА* (*The Statute of the Grand Prince Jaroslav*),³² an expanded and more systematic ecclesiastical measure most probably issued in 1051,³³ in the same year that the

³⁰ Presniakov, *Лекции*, 1: 117; and F. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe* (London, 1949), p. 255.

³¹ Vernadsky, "Status," pp. 308–309. Cf. Golubinsky, 1: 616–627; and Zernov, "Vladimir," who perhaps rather unwisely goes so far as to attribute to the Kievan prince absolute powers based upon partial inscriptions on the coinage of the Vladimirian age. On the numismatic inscriptions and a discussion thereof, cf. *infra*, pp. 100–102.

³² Jaroslav's *Statute* appears in several redactions, and printed in the following works: Beneshevich, *Сборникъ*, 1: 78–79; Fritzlér, pp. 14 ff.; Iushkov, *Памятники*, 1: 259–276; Tikhomirov, *Хрестоматия*, pp. 232–237; and Szeftel and Eck, pp. 247–265, the latter including text and commentary. Critical textual analyses of the *Statute* appear in Goetz, *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands*, pp. 39–45; Nikol'sky, *Материалы*, pp. 140–143; Iushkov, *Общественно-политический строй*, pp. 211–216; Shcharov, *Княжеские уставы*, pp. 178 ff.; and Demidenko, pp. 273–287.

³³ Major disagreements persist among scholars on the precise year in which Jaroslav's *Statute* was published. The prince himself remarks that his church statute became effective when Metropolitan Hilarion sat as the ecclesiastical head of the Rus' church in 1051 and then served in that position for at least three years. *X, ИСПИ* 22/1: 369, cites his elevation to the metropolitan seat in 1051; and p. 464, lists him as the sixth metropolitan of Kiev, preceded, however, by Cyril (КЪРИЛЪ) and followed by Ephrem (ЕФРЕМЪ). Vlasto, pp. 281 ff., appears to

Rus'-born Hilarion was elevated to the metropolitan seat of Kiev and awarded jurisdiction over all Christians residing within the principality, Jaroslav asserted:³⁴

ПО ДАННЮ ОТЦА СВОЕГО, СЪГДАДЬ ЕСТЬ СЪ МНТРОПОЛИТОМЪ КИЕВЬСКИМЪ И
ВЕСА РУСИ ИЛАРИОНОМЪ, СЛОЖИХОМЪ ГРЕЧЕСКИИ НОМОКАНОН, ЪЖЕ НЕ ПОДОБАЕТЪ
СНУХЪ ТЫЖЬ СУДИТИ КНАЗЮ, НИ БОЛШРОМЪ ЕГО, НИ СУДИМЪ ЕГО; ДАЛ ЪЕМЬ
МНТРОПОЛИТУ И ЕПИСКОПОМЪ РОСПЪЕТЫ ПО ВСЕМЪ ГОРОДОМЪ ДЕСЯТЪЮ НЕДЕЛЮ
МУТА ВЪ ЦЕРКВИ И КЪ МНТРОПОЛИТУ

In accordance with the bequest of his father, I have consulted with Hilarion, the Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Rus', [being] written in the Greek *Nomokanon*, [that] it is not then fitting for the prince to judge those legal [ecclesiastical] matters, nor for his *bojary*, nor for his judges. I have awarded to the metropolitan and the bishops jurisdiction over all towns, [awarded] the income of the tenth week to the church and to the metropolitan

The competence of the higher clergy to adjudicate cases of disciplinary injunctions in ecclesiastical matters, that is, specific offenses against the church, is clearly established in this statute. Jaroslav, while preserving the essential features of his father's *Statute*, improved upon earlier ecclesiastical tradition and delimited the jurisdiction of secular and religious legal powers. He made no major modifications to the nature of princely authority and did not weaken his own powers.³⁵ In their respective church *Statutes*, Vladimir and Jaroslav admit that they drew upon the example of the *Νομοκάνων* and hence emerge as defenders and guardians of the Rus' church. As God's vicars upon earth and the appointed of God, these princes received the task to set in order the temporal and spiritual spheres of legal authority within the principality, a principle to which Rus' churchmen subscribed.

allude to the fact that the *Statute* was decreed about 1039, a few years after construction was undertaken of the metropolitan church of Saint Sophia or known also as the Church of the Holy Wisdom. The *Уставъ князи мѣтопийни сводъ*, p. 41, records the date of this document as 1053, a rather late date and not in consonance with the evidence at hand that Hilarion may have no longer been metropolitan and that the cordial state and ecclesiastical relations between Constantinople and Kiev had been reestablished at the partial price of sacrificing his ecclesiastical office. The year of 1051 is reaffirmed in the recent scholarly effort of Ia. N. Shcharov, "Устав князя Ярослава и вопорс об отношении к византискому наследнию на Руси в середина XI в.," *ВВ* 31 (1971): 75.

³⁴ Veneshevich, *Сборникъ*, 1: 78. However, Shcharov, "Устав князя Ярослава," p. 75, states that Hilarion held the seat (*на кафедре*) from 1051 to 1053, but not after Jaroslav's death in February 1054. The annals are silent for the years 1052 and 1053, making no reference to him. Shcharov's assertion, therefore, remains suspect, but should not be dismissed as unfactual.

³⁵ Iushkov, *Общественного-политический строй*, pp. 215–216.

The *Νομοκάνων* of John Scholastikos enabled the Kievan princes to acquire a fundamental knowledge of Byzantine imperial theory. The handbook includes extracts from the imperial *Novellae* of Justinian I (527–565),³⁶ and his two other bodies of law: the *Codex*³⁷ and *Digesta*.³⁸ Scholastikos's *Νομοκάνων* became an integral part of the *Κορμίδα Κνήγη* (*The Pilot's Handbook*), a mid-tenth century work apparently translated into Old Slavonic in Bulgaria and introduced into Kievan Rus' soon after Vladimir's conversion.³⁹ The original Slavic copyist of the *Νομοκάνων* demonstrates license and selectivity in the process of translating Byzantine secular laws. But even through a process of discriminate selectivity of parts of Justinian's *Novellae* and other works, the *Νομοκάνων* contains commentary upon the divine origins of the church and the state, and the duty of the emperor to maintain harmony between the spiritual and temporal powers.⁴⁰

Justinian's scribes elaborate upon the ideal notion that the obligation of his imperial office emanated from *φιλανθρωπία* (philanthropy), God's benevolence and His love for mankind. Thus this was the source of his imperial function as the primary legislator and the living law. Philanthropy guided the *autokrator* in the just fulfillment of his imperial role and the protective maintenance of his subjects. The appreciative recognition that imperial

³⁶ *Novellae Iustiniani, Imp. Iustiniani Novellae quae vocantur ...*, ed. K.E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1881); and in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, eds. R. Schoell and W. Kroll, 3 (Berlin, 1923; reissued Hildesheim, 1993). Though dated but still valuable is the historical study of F.A. Biener, *Geschichte der Novellen Justinians* (Berlin, 1824; repr. Aalen, 1970). Cf. Anna Maria Bartoletti Colombo, ed., *Novellae* (Milan, 1986–); and Marie Theres Fögen, "Novels of Justinian I," *ODB* 3: 1497–1498.

³⁷ *Codex Justinianus*, ed. P. Krueger (Berlin, 1877); and the reissue of this work in *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 2 (9th ed., Berlin, 1915; and reissue, Hildesheim, 1991), without any major emendations. Cf. Marie Theres Fögen, "Codex Justinianus," *ODB* 1: 474–475.

³⁸ Divided into fifty books, this cumbersome and defective work is critically examined by A.A. Vasiliev, "Justinian's Digest. In Commemoration of the 1400th Anniversary of the Publication of the Digest (A.D. 533–1933)," *SBN* 5 (1939): 711–734. For a brief and more recent study of the *Digesta* with literature, cf. Marie Theres Fögen, "Digest," *ODB* 1: 623. Cf. *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, ed. W. Kroll, et al., 1 (Hildesheim, 1989). For the complete text, cf. A. Watson, trans., *The Digest of Justinian*, 2 vols. (rev. ed., Philadelphia, 1998; and reissued 2008), with extensive commentary.

³⁹ Nikon; and on the question of the original translation of *The Pilot's Handbook* into Slavonic, cf. T. Saturník, *Příspevky k šíření byzantského práva u Slovany*. RČAV 1/64 (Prague, 1922): 18–20; and Ia. N. Shcharov, *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Русь в XI–XIII вв.* (Moscow, 1978), *passim*.

⁴⁰ *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3: 35–36. On the crucial issue of harmony between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium*, cf. G.V. Vernadsky, "Византийския учения о власти царя и патриарха," in *Сборникъ статей, посвященныхъ памяти Н. П. Кондакова* (Prague, 1926), pp. 143–154.

authority was divinely imparted inspired a sense of responsibility in the *autokrator*.⁴¹ Justinian's edict of 6 March 535, *Novella VI*, a constituent part of the *Νομοκάνων* of John Scholastikos and therefore known to the Kievan Rus' through its transmission by Greek high clergy and learned monks who arrived in substantial numbers following Vladimir's baptism,⁴² makes a per-spicious dichotomization between the powers of the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium*, although at no time did the emperor advocate a complete separation of church and state, but rather he sought to make a clear distinction between the two gifts of God—the functions of the *basileus* and of the clergy. *Novella VI* reads:⁴³

Maxima quidem in hominibus sunt dona dei a superna collata clementia sacerdotium et imperium, illud quidem divina ministrans, hoc autem humanis praesidens ac diligentiam exhibens; ex uno eodemque principio utraque procedentia humanam exornant vitam. Ideoque nihil sic erit studiosum imperatoribus, sicut sacerdotum honestas, cum utque et pro illis ipsis semper deo supplicant.

Indeed, the greatest amongst men are the gifts of God, brought together by mercy from above, the priesthood, and the sovereignty, the former serving the divine, the latter however presiding over humans and exhibiting attentiveness. Both proceed from the one and the same source and they adorn the life of man. And for that reason, nothing will be so zealous to the emperor as the honesty of the priesthood, since these at all times pray to God for them.

Justinian's jurists then conclude that if the priesthood is unimpaired and trustworthy of God, and the emperors rule their states with justice and honor, reciprocal agreement between the two parts will arise, and this har-

⁴¹ Parenthetically, it is doubtful that earlier Oleg had acquired or had assumed any royal distinctions, except those customary to Varangian-Slavic society, and even these are disputable. An obscure source of questionable authenticity does relate that Oleg, at the behest of the Byzantine emperor Romanos I Lekapenos (920–944), led an attack against the Khazars in 912. The incongruity of the dates is apparent and requires no further comment. The same source speaks of the “tsar of the Rus;” rendered as *Ц-Л-г-в*. On this source, cf. P.K. Kokovtsov, *Еврейско-хазарская переписка в X веке* (Leningrad, 1932), pp. xxxii–xxxvi and 118–120. Cf. S. Schechter, “An Unknown Khazar Document,” *JQR* 3 (1912): 181–219.

⁴² We have seen the impact of this influence in the previous chapter, wherein the high clergy, mainly of Byzantine stock, admonished Vladimir for his weaknesses in addressing the problems created by bandits and of his failure to punish them. Cf. *supra*, pp. 45–46.

⁴³ *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3: 35–36. Cf. the English renditions of Dvornik, “Byzantine Political Ideas,” pp. 82–83; Barker, pp. 75–76; and F. Dvornik, “Constantinople and Rome,” in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, 4/1: 436. An Old Church Slavonic rendition of this passage appears in the late eleventh-century *Ѣфремиѣ Кормчѣи*, in I.I. Sreznevsky, “Обозрѣніе русскихъ списковъ Кормчѣи Книги,” *СОРЯС* 65/2, part 2 (1897): 67–68.

mony will be most beneficial to mankind.⁴⁴ This definition of Christian Hellenism was accepted by the Rus' church and Vladimir and Jaroslav approved of Justinian's *Novella VI*, not because they possessed priestly powers, but because the Kievan church hierarchy as the Byzantine was aware that many secular laws affecting the church would have to be issued through the initiative of the state, since only this polity had the means to enforce legal prescriptions while the ecclesiastical body lacked enforcement authority in the secular sphere, aside from denial of the sacraments and the power of excommunication.

The Rus' church, however, did not desire to diminish the powers of the Kievan princes while enlarging its own. The Rus' ecclesiastical hierarchy, generally placed under the authority of a native-born Greek metropolitan who received his office in Kiev from the patriarch of Constantinople,⁴⁵ wished to mirror the Byzantine church structure. The Rus' religious hierarchy, nevertheless, had to take notice that their neophyte church structure was established in a land where princely rule was often disorganized, frequently subject to regional challenges to power and deep-seated territorial exclusivity as is evidenced in the numerous annals. These predominating and often repeated factors made the role of churchmen a difficult one. The Kievan principality at least in theory lacked the Byzantine qualities of absolute imperial rule and political centralization, features that served the Greek church structure well.

Val'denberg has advanced the notion that the church statutes, by distinguishing between the spheres of ecclesiastical and secular legal jurisdiction, in effect placed a limitation upon the authority of the Kievan princes.⁴⁶ A major refutation of his argumentation appears in the *ПБД* entry for 996.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, 3: 36.

⁴⁵ Cf. D. Obolensky, "Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations," *DOP* 11 (1957): 25–26, wherein he advances a rather controversial argument that "... an agreement was concluded between the authorities of Constantinople and Kiev—in other words between the Emperor Basil II and Prince Vladimir I—by the terms of which the primates of the Russian Church—i.e. the metropolitan of Kiev—were for all times to be appointed according to the principle of alternative nationality, a native Russian succeeding a Byzantine, and vice-versa." Such a document, if ever concluded, could be interpreted as further proof of the equality of the two rulers and a refutation of the notion that Vladimir subordinated his own authority to that of the Byzantine *autokrator*. That such a document does not exist can be demonstrated by its absence nor reference to it in the annals and other writings of the period.

⁴⁶ Val'denberg, *Древнерусская учения*, pp. 87–88.

⁴⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; and 2: 111. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР*, 1: 170–171.

The Kievan Rus' bishops admonished Vladimir for allowing the number of bandits, who may well have been former Varangian and Slavic troops whom he had previously employed for his military expeditions but were now unemployed, to multiply throughout the principality and for failing to punish them. Their disruptive activities as is evident had a profound impact upon the secular and religious branches of Rus' society, precipitating not only undo distress and bodily harm, but great material and property losses as well. The Rus' bishops called upon Vladimir as the elect of God to chastise the offenders and to punish them after the application of due process of law. The bishops did not attempt to encroach upon his powers, but rather sought to give a Christian interpolation to the authority that he enjoyed, but which the Kievan prince was reluctant to apply, given his confusion or misunderstanding of the impact that Christianization had upon Kievan rulership.

The publication of Vladimir's and Jaroslav's church statutes and the introduction of the tithe system provide additional proof that the princes' powers were unimpaired by ecclesiastical encroachment. Vladimir and Jaroslav responded to these questions, as had the Byzantine emperors in their own ecclesiastical matters, interpreting their actions to be a prerogative respectfully of princely and imperial authority. This prerogative was extended to these Christian rulers as lawgivers and God's representatives and protectors of His church upon earth.⁴⁸ While the Byzantine notion of protective maintenance of agreement between the secular and religious spheres was transmitted to the Kievan Rus', there is insufficient evidence that demonstrates that this political philosophy placed an impediment upon the Kievan princes' authority and as a result limited their powers. Vladimir who had taken the initial step to establish the foundations of Christian ecclesiastical legal jurisdiction and then Jaroslav who further delimited church competence in specific religious-legal matters, accomplished these actions without sacrificing any major parts of their princely authority.

The *Νομοκάνων* of John Scholastikos, having furnished to the Kievan princes an essential but rudimentary notion of imperial thought, was supplanted by the more complex and manageable *Канонический сборникъ XIV титуловъ*, the *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*,⁴⁹ a Slavonic text that may have appeared in Kievan Rus' in the last decade of Jaroslav's rule, although the

⁴⁸ Dvornik, "Byzantine Political Ideas," p. 97.

⁴⁹ For editions of this work, cf. *supra*, p. 80, n. 25.

date of its introduction cannot be established with any certainty. The *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles* contains the decrees of general councils and regional synods, and canons of the church fathers. In distinguishing between the privileges identified with secular and religious laws, again the idea prevails that imperial authority derives from God and the imperial office was created to preserve tranquility with His divine institution, the church. Thus it was beneficial for this ecclesiastical body to have a secular ruler who demonstrated devotion to God and maintained a stable politically organized state unencumbered by succession disputes and the bloodshed attendant with such quarrels.⁵⁰ At the same time, the emperor is called upon to exercise justice in the performance of his functions and to promulgate both secular and ecclesiastical laws in accordance with the divine law.⁵¹

The Old Slavonic redaction of the *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles* contains the 102 canons issued by the Fifth-Sixth Ecumenical Council, known as *Quinisextum* or *Trullanum* because it met in Trullo in 691–692. The council set out to complete the work of reforming church discipline left unaddressed by the Fifth and Sixth Councils.⁵²

Appended to the canons was a letter dispatched from the council to the Byzantine emperor Justinian II (685–695 and again 705–711), seeking his seal of approval, but, more important, further elaborating upon Byzantine political ideas. The principal conception that emerges from these canons is the reformulation in a much broader context the notion of the Byzantine emperor as the appointed of God whose task it is as the terrestrial ruler to superintend the universe and to care for earthly matters.⁵³ A claim is thus made that the Byzantine emperors are paramount in their powers and authority over all earthly rulers and institutions.

Some significance should be attached, but with caution, to the appearance of the *Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles* in Kievan Rus' and its relevance to the conflict that erupted between Kiev and Constantinople. The *ПВЛ* entry for 1043 without citing the cause or causes for the disagreement simply records:⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Beneshevich, *Древне-славянская кормчая*, pp. 94–102 and 126–129.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Cf. A. Papadakis, "Trullo, Council in," *ODB* 3: 2126–2127, with bibliography.

⁵³ Beneshevich, *Древне-славянская кормчая*, pp. 132 ff.

⁵⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 154; and 2: 142. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 138; and *БЛДР* 1: 196–197. Note also the narrative account of this attack in *В, ПСРЛ* 7: 331; and *Х*, 22/1: 369, the latter stating that a storm destroyed their boats en route to Constantinople and "many men bent." For an exposition and critical examination of this attack, including comprehensive historiographic treatment, cf. A. Poppe, "La dernière expedition russe contre Constantinople," *Bs* 32 (1971): 1–29 and 233–

ПОСЛА ЯРОСЛАВЪ СНА СВОЕГО ВОЛОДИМЕРА' НА ГРЪБЫ' И ВДА ЕМУ БОИ МНОГЪ'

Jaroslav sent his son Vladimir against the Greeks and gave him a great army.

Bishop Adam of Bremen, a contemporary to this event, relates in his ecclesiastical account:⁵⁵

Cujus metropolita civitas est Chive aemula sceptri Constantinopolitani, clarissimum decus Graeciae.

Their metropolitan city is Kiev, the rival of the scepter of Constantinople, the brightest ornament of Greece.

This rivalry should not be understood in a political, commercial or military context. Rather, Adam viewed Kiev as a religious center that might advance the pretension of claiming to be the equal of the imperial city, although it is doubtful that the Rus' capital would or could achieve such eminence in that period, or the bishop is prone to exaggerate in his analogy. He may have been influenced by other unstated causes. Greek sources shed little light on the question of causation. The conflict may have been provoked as Kedrenos suggests by a quarrel, which broke out between Rus' and Byzantine merchants in the city of Constantinople.⁵⁶ Of greater significance, however, is the general interpretation that the Greeks ascribe to the attack. Kedrenos relates:⁵⁷

Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἰούνιον μῆνα τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιπεμήσεως καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ῥῶς κίνησις κατὰ τῆς βασιλίδος.

And moreover a movement of the nation of the Rus' took place in the month of June of the same [eleventh] indiction against the kingdom [Byzantium].

268 (q.v. 2–7). Also, Shekera, pp. 130–133; Poppe, *Państwo i kościół*, pp. 69–76; and Tikhomirov, *Исторические связи*, pp. 125–126. Cf. the study of G.G. Litavrin, “Война Руси против Византии в 1043 г.,” in *Исследования по истории Славянских и Балканских народов. Эпоха средневековья*, ed. V.D. Koroliuk, et al. (Moscow, 1972), pp. 178–222. Nazarenko, pp. 190 and 216, addresses some of the economic issues leading to this conflict, although we should be cautious in accepting his argumentation because the issues then between Kiev and Constantinople were far more complex, both political and religious in context, and not simply a singular economic cause. Cf. on this expedition, the discussion of Shaikin, pp. 231–232. As well, see the discussion of causes and other aspects, especially literary, in Shepard, “Byzantium and Russia in the Eleventh Century,” pp. 262–347.

⁵⁵ Adam of Bremen, “Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum,” *PL* 146 (Paris, 1884): 514 (II.19). Cf. the edition of this text in *MGH, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*, ed. B. Schmeidler (Hanover and Leipzig, 1917), p. 80; and *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*, trans. F.J. Tschan, *Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies* 53 (New York, 1959; repr. 2002), p. 67.

⁵⁶ Kedrenos 2: 551.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

A professor of rhetoric at the university in Constantinople and an eyewitness to the Rus' aggression against the empire, Constantine Psellos (Michael being the name he adopted upon entering religious life) speaks more harshly of the barbarians from the north and their insane hatred for the empire. Psellos views their assault as unjustifiable and ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, "against Roman [Greek] hegemony."⁵⁸ Budovnits argues that the phrase should be rendered as "against Roman power."⁵⁹ His translation is questionable, although plausible. However, he overlooks the fact that at the time the Byzantines were preoccupied with internal imperial political problems and were not attempting either to provoke the Rus' or to extend their supremacy elsewhere.⁶⁰ Psellos adds that the Byzantines lacked vigilance at the moment and this was the cause for the Rus' attack,⁶¹ implying that Jaroslav was taking advantage of their internal preoccupations. When Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055) assumed the imperial seat and consolidated his hold over the empire, although his military forces proved to be decisive over the Rus', he could not turn the victory to his advantage nor could he utilize the superiority of his position as emperor to demonstrate outstanding statesmanship in his relations with Jaroslav. The Rus' emerged from the conflict diplomatically none the worse. They continued to challenge the nature of their role *vis-à-vis* the *imperium*. A more dispassionate though sympathetic treatment of Constantine IX's rule is presented by Michael Attaleiates,⁶² a member of the imperial court and an eyewitness to Byzantine-Rus' relations during the course of Constantine IX's and Jaroslav's periods of rule. In his straightforward description of the Rus' attack, Attaleiates stresses only the military aspects of the event without elaborating upon the causes and consequences of the assault, nor upon the

⁵⁸ Psellos (Sewter), p. 199, and esp. pp. 199–203 (VI. 90–96), for a full rendering of the attack and the Byzantine victory; and the Renauld edition, 2: 8 ff. Cf. G.G. Litavrin, "Псела о причинах после днего похода русских на Константинополь в 1043 г.," *ВВ* 27 (1967): 71–86.

⁵⁹ I.U. Budovnits, *Общественно-политическая мысль древней руси (XI-XIV вв.)* (Moscow, 1960), p. 64.

⁶⁰ Cf. Jane M. Hussey, "The Later Macedonians, the Comneni and the Angeli 1025–1204," in *The Cambridge Medieval History* 4/1: 202–203.

⁶¹ Psellos (Sewter), p. 199; and the Renauld edition, 2: 8.

⁶² Michael Attaleiates, *Ἱστορία*, ed. I. Bekker, CSHB (Bonn, 1853), pp. 20–21; and A. Kaldellis and D. Krallis, trans., *Michael Attaleiates: The History*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 16 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2012). Descriptive accounts of Attaleiates's work with bibliographical sources are given in Krumbacher, 1: 269–271; Moravcsik, 1: 428–430; and A. Kazhdan, "Attaleiates, Michael," *ODB* 1: 229.

place of the Rus' within the *imperium*. Psellos also had access to the imperial court and his account appears to include privileged information that does not appear in Attaleiates's account. The question, then, must be raised: Does Psellos imply that Constantine IX believed that the Rus' did come under Byzantine hegemony in both the context of the *imperium* and *sacerdotium*, or simply the latter?

The response to this question is not simple and some scholars have attempted a fuller understanding of the causes leading to the Rus' attack of 1043. Priselkov suggests that the Rus' attack was a reaction to Byzantine religious and hierarchical domination.⁶³ Although *ἡγεμονεία* could be translated as either under the "influence" or presumably under the "authority" of the Byzantine emperor, we should rather concentrate upon those aspects of "authority" that could have diminished the powers of Jaroslav and subordinated the Kievan prince to the secular and religious will of the Byzantine emperor. The religious evidence found in *ПВЛ* for the years 1036 to 1054 provides some clues in the absence of any precise Byzantine attestations. The year after Jaroslav had become the sole ruler of Kievan Rus', he laid the foundation for the construction of the Church of Saint Sophia in Kiev and designated this edifice the metropolitan church for the recently appointed Greek-born Theopemptos.⁶⁴ A religious rapprochement had thus been reached between Kiev and Constantinople following the dissolution of the dual principalities, but the compilers of *ПВЛ* are most approving of Jaroslav's desire to have Greek books rendered into Church Slavonic, and to write and collect works.⁶⁵ If we accept the validity of this annalistic statement, the introduction on a much greater scale of Byzantine religious writings and some

⁶³ Priselkov, pp. 88–90. The question of causality is substantially studied by J. Shepard, "Why did the Russians attack Byzantium in 1043," *B-NJ* 22 (1977–1984): 147–212, esp. 148–153, wherein he postulates four possible causes, but dismisses the first three as improbable and stresses the fourth, the importance of Rus' trade with Byzantium and the "anti-Russian policies pursued by the Byzantine government." There follows in his essay an extensive analysis of the sources, both primary and secondary, that elaborate upon causality. More recently, Mel'nikova, pp. 127–132, reexamines the primary sources on this event.

⁶⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 151; and 2: 139. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДП* 1: 192–193. On the formation of this metropolitan seat, cf. the lucid discussion of A.V. Porpe, "Русские метрополии константинопольской патриархии в XI столетии," *ВВ* 28 (1968): 86–96. T. Barsov, *Константинопольский патриарх и его власть надъ русскою церковію* (St. Petersburg, 1878), pp. 368–369, maintains that the first metropolitan see was established in Kievan Rus' at the inception of Vladimir's Christian rule, hence ca. 987 or 988, the year of his baptism. The evidence, at best, is tenuous to arrive at such a conclusion and is unconvincing.

⁶⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 151–152; and 2: 140. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 137; and *БЛДП* 1: 194–195 and 509.

secular works, and the translation, interpretation, and dissemination of their contents appear to have set the stage for the Rus' attack of 1043. Tatishchev writes that there was a great difference of opinion between Jaroslav and Constantine IX Monomachos,⁶⁶ and their disagreement cannot be simply explained as a quarrel over the death of some Rus' merchants in the imperial city. Rather, the causality and issues appear to have much broader implications and were more complex. Between 1036 and 1043, Jaroslav appears to have suspected from his reading and understanding of Greek books that the Byzantines sought to dominate not only the religious will of the Rus', but as well their political. On ideological grounds then Jaroslav sought to loosen the constraints that the Byzantines sought to impose upon him and his state. Kedrenos and Psellos are therefore accurate in reporting that the Rus' attack in 1043 was a revolt against Byzantine authority, without finding a need to differentiate between secular and ecclesiastical domination, for both were implied. The negotiations that followed the Rus' military defeat were without result.⁶⁷ Jaroslav's emissaries must have resisted Constantine Monomachos's attempt to view the Kievan prince as a vassal with reduced political powers. While the Byzantine emperor sought to execute his imperial designs upon the Rus', other disquieting domestic and foreign problems precluded such an initiative of subordination and the Kievan prince and his state remained independent of Constantinople in the imperial and commonwealth sense.

In addition to maintaining his political independence, Jaroslav in 1051 set out to alter the nature of the affiliation of the Rus' metropolitan see to the patriarchate. In that year he assembled his bishops who elected Hilarion, a priest from the prince's estate at Berestovo and a partisan of the prince's designs. Hilarion, even if briefly, emerges as the first native-born metropolitan of Rus'.⁶⁸ Constantine Monomachos appears to have been sufficiently alarmed at Jaroslav's intransigence that he sought to accommodate the prince. We know few details of their agreement. The absence of any further reference to Hilarion in *IBT* beyond this initial entry of his elevation leads to the suspicion that he held this office for a relatively short period, perhaps no more than three years. And the marriage of Jaroslav's son Vsevolod to a Byzantine princess identified as Maria, who may have been a daughter of the

⁶⁶ Tatishchev, 1: 79.

⁶⁷ Kedrenos 2: 551–552.

⁶⁸ *ICPI* 1: 155; and 2: 143. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 139; and *БЛДП* 1: 196–197 and 509.

emperor Constantine IX Monomachos, but was regarded as a non-phyrogettene princess,⁶⁹ supports the notion that Hilarion by agreement was retired or removed in favor of a Greek-born prelate. The marriage contract may have also implied that hereafter Greeks once more would sit upon the Rus' metropolitan throne.⁷⁰ The ideological struggle that had its inception at the inauguration of Jaroslav's sole rule appears to have been resolved in 1052. As prince of Kievan Rus', Jaroslav was willing to relinquish some of his authority over the highest church office within his principality, but then only the nominative power. He fully accepted Greek ecclesiastical law as applicable in Kievan Rus', but sacrificed precious little of his political authority.

Civil jurisprudence of the Rus' became enriched soon after their conversion with the introduction of the *Ἐκλογή* (*Ecloga*), an abridged legal handbook compiled by Byzantine jurists in the mid-eighth century at the behest of the Iconoclastic emperor Leo III (717–741) and his son Constantine V (741–775).⁷¹ This code appears to have been translated into Old Church Slavonic by the brother-saints Cyril (Constantine the Philosopher) and Methodios,⁷² who in 863 introduced Byzantine Christianity and law to the Great Moravian Empire.⁷³ The *Ecloga* entered Kievan Rus' the following century by way of Bulgaria. In Rus', the work came to be known as the *ЗАКОНЪ СУДНЫИ ЛЮДЬМЪ* (*The Juridical Law for Laymen*).⁷⁴ Rus' acquaintance with the Slavonic version

⁶⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 160; and 2: 149. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 142; and *БЛДР* 1: 202–203 and 510.

⁷⁰ Priselkov, pp. 110–114.

⁷¹ For printed editions of the *Ἐκλογή*, cf. *supra*, pp. 79–80, n. 24.

⁷² J. Vašica, "Origine Cyrillo-Méthodienne du plus ancien code slave dit 'Zakon sudnyj ljudem,'" *Bs* 12 (1951): 153–174; and Vl. Procházka, "Le Zakonъ Sudnyjъ ljudьmъ et la Grande Moravie," *Bs* 29 (1969): 112–150. On Constantine the Philosopher, cf. P.A. Hollingsworth, "Constantine the Philosopher," *ODB* 1: 507, with substantial bibliography.

⁷³ The principal studies of the Great Moravian Empire remain: F. Dvornik, *Les Slavs, Byzance et Rome au IX^e siècle* (Paris, 1926), pp. 147–183; *idem*, *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, *Bs*, Supplementa 1 (Prague, 1933): 212 ff.; Vlasto, pp. 20–85; J. Dekan, *Moravia Magna: The Great Moravian Empire, Its Art and Times* (Bratislava, 1980); Z.R. Dittrich, *Christianity in Great Moravia* (Gröningen, 1962); J. Poulik and B. Chropovsky, *Grossmähren und die Anfänge der tschechoslowakischen Staatlichkeit* (Prague, 1986); and W.K. Hanak, "The Great Moravian Empire: An Argument for a Northern Location," *MHB* 4 (1995): 7–24. For a controversial study, cf. I. Boba, *Moravia's History Reconsidered: A Reinterpretation of Medieval Sources* (The Hague, 1971).

⁷⁴ For numerous redactions of this text, cf. *Закон судный людем. Краткой редакциии*, ed. M.N. Tikhomirov (Moscow, 1961); *Закон судный людем. Пространной и сводной редакциии*, ed. M.N. Tikhomirov (Moscow, 1961); *Мерило праведное по рукописи XIV века*, ed. M.N. Tikhomirov (Moscow, 1961); and H.W. Dewey, and Ann M. Kleimola, trans. with

of the *Ecloga* is not diminished by the fact that at the time of its introduction into Great Moravia, the Byzantine emperor Basil I had taken steps to discard this basic law in favor of the *Πρόχειρος Νόμος* (*The Common Law*),⁷⁵ that made a much later appearance in Kievan Rus'. *The Juridical Law for Laymen* had a minimal impact upon the codification of Rus' civil jurisprudence. Its influence is not evident during Vladimir's rule, but rather its appearance early in the reign of Jaroslav. In 1016, during the course of his succession crisis and his armed conflicts with Mstislav and Svjatopolk, Jaroslav was called upon to concede to his Varangian followers a codification of Rus' customary law, wherein primary stress was placed upon prescriptive punitive norms for civil offenses. However, borrowings found in the *Русская Правда* (*Rus' Law*) from the *Ecloga* are most evident where it directs that if a man takes a horse of another and does not return it, he must pay the injured party three *grivna*—a monetary unit of varying and indeterminate value.⁷⁶

The Rus' princes as a result became the recipients of some primary and typical features of Byzantine ecclesiastical and civil jurisprudence. But there remains the problem of the transmittal of Byzantine political ideology. No evidence survives demonstrating that a major Greek political treatise had been rendered into Old Slavonic.⁷⁷ Had the Rus' for example received during Vladimir's rule the full text of the *Ecloga* with Leo III's introduction, wherein he states the notion that an emperor is the appointed of God and his authority derives from the consent of the Almighty, the Kievan prince and his successors might have had an easier task in ascertaining their respective roles *vis-à-vis* the emperor. The Rus' ecclesiastical hierarchy, however, formulated an independent Christian tradition of princely rulership that often was defective and incomplete in its conceptualization, but which they were moved on occasion to remonstrate in their writings and notably in *ПВД* with no extensive elaboration or commentary:⁷⁸ **ТЫ ПОСТАВЛЕНЪ ЯЕИ ѿ Бѧ**, "You

commentary, *Zakon Sudnyj Ljudem* (*Court Law for People*), Michigan Slavic Materials 14 (Ann Arbor, 1977). For textual description and criticisms, cf. N.S. Suvorov, *Следы западнокатолическаго церковнаго права въ памятникахъ древняго русскаго права* (Jaroslav, 1888), pp. 9–12; *idem*, *Къ вопросу о западномъ влияніи на древне-русское право* (Jaroslav, 1893), pp. 155–274; Saturnik, pp. 33–58; Vašica; M.N. Tikhomirov, *Пособие для изучения Русской Правды* (Moscow, 1953), pp. 125–126; Procházka; and Tikhomirov, *Исторические связи*, pp. 196–217.

⁷⁵ This law was published between 869 and 879. For editions, cf. K.E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Ἐ Πρόχειρος Νόμος ...* (Heidelberg, 1837); repr., Zepos, 2.

⁷⁶ Saturnik, pp. 51–52.

⁷⁷ Dvornik, "Byzantine Political Ideas," pp. 75–76.

⁷⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; and 2: 111. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

are the elect of God.” It was rather auspicious for the Rus’ princes that their learned churchmen turned to their knowledge of Old Testament texts for elucidating a Christian interpolation of rulership. In this way the Rus’ utilized one of the basic sources of Byzantine thought without fully obligating themselves as subject peoples to the *imperium*.⁷⁹

A notation in *ПѢД* that upon assuming sole rule of Kievan Rus’ Jaroslav ordered the translation of Greek works into Old Slavonic and gathered books.⁸⁰ This statement appears suspicious on several grounds. First, the Rus’ annalists make no attempt to catalogue the titles or to quote from the content of the materials introduced into the principality, unless and this is quite plausible that these works were mainly liturgical texts in manuscript form and were employed in religious ceremonies. Secondly, we can find no demonstrable evidence that these manuscripts had an immediate and significant impact upon the formulation of Kievan thought beyond the religious in the final decades of Jaroslav’s rule. Other paradoxes are to be noted. The importation of essential texts translated into Old Slavonic in the previous century was already substantial and available, although they came mainly by way of Bulgaria and a few from Great Moravia, but were slow to arrive in the Rus’ regions north of the Pontus, whereas the volume of Greek manuscripts was also most likely small, at least in the first century following Christianization, since we have no evidence to prove the contrary. We are confronted with the paradox that as the early Rus’ the Byzantine apologists provide no suitable explanations. Thus, the volume of translations accomplished by this prince and his scribes must have been comparatively small. The mere fact of making copies of essential works was a cumbersome task and time consuming for the Greek and Bulgarian monks. We have numerous examples in later centuries where texts that were copied required periods for accomplishment from twenty-five years to several centuries. Also, the number of qualified monks to make these copies was small and we witness more than one hand in the accomplishment of this process. Thus irregular reception of Byzantine texts, whether in Greek or Old Slavonic, was commonplace and the prospect of availability unpredictable. Also, though Jaroslav favored Byzantine canon laws, as Ikonnikov suggests, the Greek laws had a binding aspect upon the new converts.⁸¹ It is understandable then that

⁷⁹ Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy*, *passim*. Cf. Shepard, “Byzantium and Russia in the Eleventh Century,” *passim*.

⁸⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 151–152; and 2: 139–140. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 137–138; and *БЛДР* 1: 194–195 and 509.

⁸¹ V. Ikonnikov, *Опытъ изслѣдованія о культурномъ значеніи византии въ русской исторіи* (Kiev, 1869), p. 296.

Vladimir and Jaroslav would circumvent dependency by vacillating in their adoption of Greek and Old Slavonic versions of the main Byzantine religious and secular legal and political literature. They suspected quite correctly that Byzantine emperors would seize the opportunity to dominate the minds and souls of the Rus' princes and subjects.

If the early Rus' scribes were so impressed with Byzantine political and religious thought and also the ceremonial that their writings should reflect a positive pro-Greek tendency, the textual images of Vladimir and Jaroslav do not offer sufficient evidence that either prince was awarded greater noble distinctions by the emperors. Modern historical scholarship⁸² has generally rejected and correctly so the attribution cited in the *Toparcha Gothicus*,⁸³ an anonymous source, perhaps a nineteenth-century forgery, but claimed to have been compiled at the end of the tenth or at the beginning of the eleventh century, in which Vladimir is designated βασιλεύων, a participle signifying a reigning monarch and his relationship to the Byzantine emperor. Ihor Ševčenko has demonstrated that Byzantine emperors rarely awarded imperial titles, and then reluctantly so. He continues to add that the *Toparcha Gothicus*, in keeping with the German traditions of the nineteenth century, "endowed rulers of Rus' in the tenth and eleventh centuries with German equivalents of imperial titles"⁸⁴ Yet, some modern scholars find additional corroboration for this imperial rank in *ПВЛ* and the later Rus' annals that draw upon this early tradition. *ПВЛ* records for the year 1011: **Прѣставилѣ црѣва Володимерова ѡнна**, "Vladimir's [wife] the *empress* Anna passed away."⁸⁵ The earlier *Toparcha Gothicus* has thus reinforced modern

⁸² Cf. Dvornik, *The Slavs*, p. 211; M.V. Levchenko, *Очерки по истории русско-византийских отношеи* (Moscow, 1956), pp. 366 ff.; Obolensky, "Principles and Methods," p. 58; and *idem*, *Byzantine Commonwealth*, pp. 200–201.

⁸³ F. Westberg, *Die Fragmente des Toparcha Gothicus (Anonymous Tauricus) aus dem 10. Jahrhundert*. ЗИАН, series 8, *Ист.-Филол.*, 5/2 (St. Petersburg, 1901); and repr. SB 18 (Leipzig, 1975). The sources are carefully and extensively analyzed by I. Ševčenko: "The Date and Author of the So-Called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus," *DOP* 25 (1971): 117–188, with twenty-seven accompanying plates; repr. in *idem*, *Byzantium and the Slavs: In Letters and Culture* (Cambridge, MA, and Naples, 1991), no. XXVI, pp. 353–477. In the reprint edition, there appears his preface, titled: "Preface to F. Westberg, *Die Fragmente des Toparcha Gothicus*," pp. vii–xiv, that is included in Ševčenko, *Byzantium and the Slavs*, no. XXX, pp. 559–573, in which he again questions the authenticity of the fragments. For a source discussion, cf. Krumbacher, 1: 268–269; and Moravcsik, 1: 551. For an analysis of the work and its several redactions, cf. Vasil'evsky, *Труды*, 2: 136 ff.

⁸⁴ Ševčenko, "The Date and Author of the So-Called Fragments," p. 415.

⁸⁵ The bold italic is mine. *ПСРЛ* 1: 129; and 2: 114. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124, wherein **ц[а]р[и]ца** is incorrectly translated as "princess," rather than empress or caesarina, although her rank is correct as a Byzantine designation, that is, a porphyrogenete princess; and *БЛДР* 1: 172–173.

learned recognition that Vladimir, upon negotiating for a marriage with the porphyrogennete princess Anna, was also distinguished with a high Byzantine court title, βασιλεύων or βασιλεύειν as Ševčenko renders it based on his reading of fragment three. He adds: "... the participle βασιλεύων [is] applied to the presumably tenth-century Rus' ruler who governed to the north of the Danube"⁸⁶ If read correctly, the attribution is to Svjatoslav, rather than Vladimir. But how accurate this titular claim is remains suspect. We should further recognize that Byzantine political theory maintained that as the emperor's powers were the gift of a Divine Power, lesser terrestrial authority emanated from earthly authority. It was therefore a function of the Byzantine emperor to grant titles and insignia to foreign rulers of lesser rank. This is not inconsistent with diplomatic and ceremonial customs that upon the conclusion of a matrimonial agreement to wed a porphyrogennete princess, benefits would accrue, granting to the Kievan prince a special relationship to the emperor and a promotion in rank. If we accept the *Statute* as a credible source and a work almost contemporaneous to the *Toparcha Gothicus*, Vladimir discredits the notion that he was the recipient of a noble distinction and hence subordinate to Constantinopolitan imperial authority. He consulted the *Νομοκάνων* and addressed to his wife "Princess Anna" questions relative to church law and administration;⁸⁷ and to establish a non-Byzantine political tradition in his church laws he states: **Є ΕΛΞΕ ΚΗΛΞΕ ΒΕΛΗΚΕΛΗ ΒΟΛΟΔΗΜΕΡΞ ...**, "I am the *grand prince* Vladimir"⁸⁸ The accuracy of the usage of **ΒΕΛΗΚΕΛΗ** is questionable, and is in all likelihood a later emendation.

Anna, perhaps given to vanity and to enhance her status, could have sought to strengthen her claim to imperial rank and sought a comparable titular distinction for her husband. Several decades earlier, her emperor-uncle John I Tzimiskes (969–976) had consented to a marriage of a Byzantine princess to Otto II, the son of the German emperor Otto I, but he spurned the elder Otto's request for the hand of a porphyrogennete princess. Otto I had sought a Byzantine marital union for his son and heir, Otto II, but also he sought to legitimize his royal house with the introduction of Byzantine imperial bloodlines. Anna, though still quite young, may have

⁸⁶ Westberg, p. 73; and Ševčenko, "Preface to F. Westberg," p. 567.

⁸⁷ Beneshevich, *Уставъ*, p. 5.

⁸⁸ The italic is mine. *Ibid.*, p. 4. Jaroslav's *Statute* also employs the term **ΒΕΛΗΚΕΛΗ**, and again this may be a later emendation that sought to imply that he as his father Vladimir enjoyed the title of "grand prince," although the usage remains suspect.

personally favored this union and looked with anticipation at the opportunity of becoming the wife of the future German emperor. When her uncle refused to grant the Germans their wish, he instead dispatched the lesser princess Theophano.⁸⁹ Doubtlessly, Anna was disappointed and no prospects for marriage appeared for her until later, in her mature years. Thus Anna, having married comparatively late for the customs of the age, sought to enhance her station in life and impressed upon the Rus' scribes that indeed she was an empress. Too, she may have exploited her knowledge of Varangian custom, as elaborated in the *Toparcha Goticus*, wherein it is stated that relations of a reigning monarch are designated with the same rank as the ruler.⁹⁰ And the fact that her brother Basil II sat upon the Byzantine imperial throne may have further motivated Anna to seek an imperial distinction.

Maria, the wife of Jaroslav's son Vsevolod, although we have no evidence to prove the contrary, does not appear in the sources to have sought an imperial identification. But *ПВА* does preserve an imperial image for her and relates in the entry for 1053:⁹¹

Ѡ ВСЕВОЛОДА РОДЕНА СЪНЪ · И НАРЕЧЕ ЕМУ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ Ѡ ЦРЦЦЪ ГРЪКЫНЪ ·

To Vsevolod by the Greek *empress* was born a son and he was named Vladimir [Monomach].

This annalistic attribution to an imperial rank is however disputed by Maria's seal that reads:⁹²

⁸⁹ For source materials on the questions relative to Theophano and her marriage to Otto II, cf. G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (New Brunswick, 1957; reprs., Oxford, 1963 and 1980), p. 263, n. 1; and esp. *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, ed. A. Davids (Cambridge, 1995), *passim*; and *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March, 1990*, eds. J. Shepard and S. Franklin (Aldershot, 1992), p. 42, n. 6.

⁹⁰ Snorri Sturluson, p. 6.

⁹¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 160; 2: 149, wherein the passage reads: Оу ВСЕВОЛОДА РОДЕНА СЪНЪ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ. Ѡ ЦРЦЦЪ ГРЪКЪКОЕ; *Н*, 3: 181, modifies the passage to read: Я у ВСЕВОЛОДА РОДЕНА СЫНЪ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ОТ ЦЕСАРИЦЪ ГРЪКЫНЪ; *Н*, 4, 117, excises reference to Vsevolod and the birth of a son by a Byzantine "empress;" *С*, 5: 138, reads as *ПВА-А*; *В*, 7: 332, adds specificity and reads: Ц ВСЕВОЛОДА РОДЕНА СЫНЪ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ МОНОМАХЪ, ОТЪ ЦАРИЦИ ГРЪКЫНИ; *ПН*, 9: 85, with some further elaboration reads as *В*; so also *Т*, 15: 151; *К*, 22/1: 171, where the passage is deleted from this annal; and as well the deletion appears in *НВ*, 42: 65. *Ник* (Zenkovsky), p. 151, renders the passage in translation as: "To Vsevolod Iaroslavich, Vladimir's grandson, was born a son: Vladimir, called Monomakh, after his mother, the Greek Imperial Princess;" the passage does not appear in *П* (Nasonov); and *Тр* (Priselkov), p. 140, that reads: ОТЪ ВСЕВОЛОДА РОДЕНА СЫНЪ, И НАРЕЧЕН ИМЯ ЕМУ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ, ОТЪ ЦАРИЦЪ ГРЪКЫНЪ. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 142, that reduces her rank to "princess"; and *БЛДР* 1: 202–203 and 510.

⁹² Bold italics mine. V.L. Ianin, *Актовые печати древней Руси X-XV вв.*, 1: *Печати*

Σφραγ[ίς] Μαρίας Μο[-]άχης τῆς εὐγενεστάτης ἀρχοντίσσης.

The Seal of Maria Monomachos, the noble *archontissa*.

No imperial title is attributed to her; rather, she is labeled an *archontissa*. The usage here should be rendered as a princess, which rank she had held. The term *archontissa* in the Greek sense implies a wife of a magistrate or governor, an ἄρχων, who was associated with the imperial court. It would be reasonable to assume that Maria Monomachos, being the wife of a Rus' prince, could find no suitable Slavonic or Greek equivalent term for her Rus' status and used a term she was familiar with to signify that her husband was a prince (although we have examples where Byzantine princes as well employed the term ἄρχων) and she was entitled to address herself in this manner, implying a princess.

Numismatic evidence additionally obscures the question of the official titles of Vladimir and Jaroslav. No radical differentiation in a symbolic depiction of their respective offices is illustrated on coinage.⁹³ The two Kievan princes are represented with an imperial crown of Byzantine design upon their heads and in their right hands each holds a scepter with a cross as an emblem of their sovereign authority. Each prince is attired in a robe with the accoutrements of ὁ λῶρος (thong) and ἡ χλαμύς (mantle), a common stylistic feature corresponding to official Byzantine imperial dress,⁹⁴ but also worn by ranking military leaders. Coins of the Vladimirian era, discovered near Belgorod shortly after the turn of the twentieth century, are of a partially different design than the above. On one side, the *recto*, we observe the Kievan prince attired in his official ceremonial robe with λῶρος, but on the verso of this mint issue there is a portrait of Christ, a common feature on Byzantine coinage after the seventh century. Two inscriptions are depicted upon these coins. There is the incomplete term ... RATOR and on another line ЯСГГГОЗ. N.I. Petrov has reconstructed the latter letters to read: [ВЛАДИМИРЪ НА СТОЛЕ] А СЕ ЕГО З[НАМЕНИ], “[Vladimir upon his throne], and with his sign [that is, scepter].”⁹⁵ The fragment ... RATOR

X-начала XIII в. (Moscow, 1970): 17, 170, no. 23; and 251, no. 23. P. 170, no. 23, displays a transcription of the seal with appended commentary and sources.

⁹³ I.I. Tolstoi, *Древнейшие русские великого княжества Киевского* (St. Petersburg, 1882); and Ianin, 1: 37 and 42–43.

⁹⁴ *Analecta Byzantino-Russica*, ed. W. Regel (St. Petersburg, 1891), pp. LXXVI–LXXX; Levchenko, *Очерки*, pp. 367–369; and Ianin, 1: 36–43.

⁹⁵ N.I. Petrov, “Древние изображения святого Владимира,” *ТКДА* (July–August, 1915), pp. 348–349.

is difficult to interpret and scholarly consensus on interpolating the term is lacking. Petrov believes that ... **RATOR** comprises the final letters of *EXUSIOCRATOR*.⁹⁶ A.V. Solov'ev, on the other hand, suggests that these are the terminal characters of *AUTOKRATOR*;⁹⁷ whereas N.P. Likhachev maintains that the title should read *IMPERATOR*.⁹⁸ Although no decisive erudite agreement has been reached on ... **RATOR** and only conjectural statements are offered,⁹⁹ Vladimir may have claimed autocratic powers and even acknowledged the lesser imperial rank awarded to him by Basil II.¹⁰⁰ But precise descriptions are lacking in early Rus' numismatic materials to establish clearly the nature of his noble distinction and its impact upon the relationship of the Kievan prince to the Byzantine emperor. The coins did serve the purpose to provide a visual depiction of his powers to his subjects, even if these powers are not now clearly understood because of the faulty evidence. Only the Rus' annals steadfastly use the distinction *САМОВЛАСТЬЦЬ* that could be rendered as *ἡ αὐταρχος* and *ЕДИНОВЛАСТЬЦЬ* and its Greek equivalent *ὁ μόναρχος*, implying either monarch or sole ruler. It appears plausible to assume that Vladimir approved the use of **AUTOKRATOR** to appear on his coinage. A similar claim cannot be made for Jaroslav. But until modern advanced scientific methods of reading coins of poor quality are applied, we are left with no clear understanding what these letters stand for or their implications.

The imprint of a representation of the prince on the *recto* and of Christ on the *verso* of coinage signifies that at an early stage the Kievan scribes and minters along with their prince accepted the essential notion that the Kievan prince derived his authority from God, as represented by Christ, and hence ruled through Divine Will. The symbolic signs of princely office, the

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ A.V. Solov'ev, "О печати и титулар Владимира святого," *Vs* 10 (1948): 31–44.

⁹⁸ N.P. Likhachev, "Материалы для истории византийской и русской сфрагистики," *TМn* 1 (Leningrad, 1928): 170.

⁹⁹ For a summation of this problem, cf. Ianin, 1: 42–43. We should address the more recent numismatic studies of early Rus' coinage. Cf. Marina P. Sotnikova and I.G. Spassky, *Тысячелетие древнейших монет России: Сводный каталог русских монет X-XI веков* (Leningrad, 1983), pp. 60–61 and 69–81; trans. into English by H. Bartlett Wells: *Russian Coins of the X-XI Centuries A. D.: Recent Research and a Corpus in Commemoration of the Earliest Russian Coinage* (Oxford, 1982); also Marina P. Sotnikova, *Древнейшие русские монеты X-XI веков: Каталог и исследование* (Moscow, 1995). Further, for a summation of the images on Rus' coinage and its widespread usage, cf. Raffensperger, pp. 27–37, and the accompanying notes, nn. 125–199, for additional interpretative literature.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. the stress placed upon the external symbols of Vladimir's office in *ПСРЛ* 21: 69 ff.

scepter and the crown or more accurately the diadem that is commonly worn by eastern monarchs, and the thong and mantel, appear to be of Byzantine provenance, but medieval rulers to denote the nature of their regal powers used these familiar emblems of office extensively.

The eulogy delivered upon Vladimir's death is modeled after Byzantine hagiographical and Byzantine court style.¹⁰¹ Drawing upon this literary tradition, *ПВЛ-А* relates:¹⁰²

СЕ ЖЕ ОУВѢДѢВЪШЕ ЛЮДЬЕ БѢЩИЛА СИНДОШАСА И ПЛАКАШАСА ПО НЕМЬ БОЛАРЕ И
 АБЫ ЗАСТУПНИКА НХЪ ЗЕМЛИ ОУБОЗНИ АБЫ ЗАСТУПНИКА И КОРМИТЕЛА И ВЛОЖИША
 И В КОРТУ МОРОМОРАНУ СХРИНИША ТѢЛО ЕГО С ПЛАЧЕМЪ БЛЖНАГО КНАЗЪ СЕ ЕСТЬ
 НОВЫИ КОСТАНТИНЪ ВЕЛНКАГО РИМА ИЖЕ КРѢТНЪСА СѦ И ЛЮДИ СВОИ ТАКО И СЪ
 СТВОРИ ПОДОБНО ЮМУ

When the people were convinced of this [his death], they gathered in great numbers, and the boyars mourned him as the defender of their land, the poor as [their] protector and benefactor, and they placed him in a marble coffin, [and] preserved the body of the blessed prince with laments. He is the new Constantine of great Rome, who baptized himself and his people. And thus he [Vladimir] did as him.

Two traditions are retained in this account. The Rus' eulogized Vladimir in consonance with Hellenistic and Byzantine court style. To this initial tradition they attached a simile, likening the Kievan prince to the founder of the East Roman or Byzantine Empire, although the division of the Roman

¹⁰¹ Dvornik, "Byzantine Political Ideas," p. 96.

¹⁰² *ПСРЛ* 1: 130–131; 2: 115–116, significantly emends the passage, reading: СЕ ЖЕ ОУВѢДѢВЪШЕ ЛЮДЬЕ И СИНДОШАСА БѢЩИЛА. И ПЛАКАШАСА ПО НЕМЬ БОЛАРЕ. АБЫ ЗАСТУПНИКА. ЗЕМЛИ НХЪ. ОУБОЗНИ АБЫ ЗАСТУПНИКА. И КОРМИТЕЛА. И ВЛОЖИША И БЪ ГРОБѢ МРАМОРАНИ. СПРАТАВШЕ ТѢЛО ЕГО С ПЛАЧЕМЪ ВЕЛНКАГО БЛЖНАГО КНАЗЪ. СЕ ЕСТЬ НОВЫИ КОСТАНТИНЪ. ВЕЛНКАГО РИМА ИЖЕ КРѢТНЪСА ЛЮДИ СВОИ ТАКО И СЪ СТВОРИША. ПОДОБНО ЮМУ АЩЕ БО БѢ ПРЕЖЕ В ПОГАНЬСТВѢ. И НА СЕВѢРНЮЮ ПОХОТЬ ЖЕЛАМ., "When the people and the countless were convinced of this ... and thus he [Vladimir] did as him [Constantine I]. For he was formerly like him a pagan, seeking obscene carnal desires," with some textual alteration *H*, 3: 169; the passage is excised from *H*, 4; *G*, 5: 124–125, with some emendations, but reads as *ПВЛ-И*; similarly, *B*, 7: 317; *PH*, 9: 69–70; *T*, 15: 122; but excised from *K* and *Va*; and like *ПВЛ-А*, so also *HB*, 42: 57. *Ник* (Zenkovsky), 1: 121, reads: "The people learned of this and an endless number of them went thither and lamented him: the boyars, because they considered him the guardian of their land, the poor lamented him as their nourisher and lord. His body was placed in a marble sarcophagus and was buried, while all wept. He was like the new Constantine of great Rome because he [Constantine], himself, became baptized, and baptized his people, and so did this [Prince Vladimir] in the same way as that other had done. Although earlier he was obsessed with evil lust ...;" *П*₁ (Nasonov), does not include this passage; and like *ПВЛ-И*, *Тр* (Priselkov), pp. 121–122. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 174–175, and 506.

Empire into two parts had been undertaken by Diocletian decades earlier. Both Vladimir and Constantine I are notable for having adopted Christianity as the official religion of the state and it is for this reason that both are highly praised in the extant literature. But hereafter the comparison ceases, for the compilers of *ΠΒΔ* sought not to contrast their respective ranks and powers. An unadorned and unembellished image is then created for Vladimir, yet we find no such lament for Jaroslav nor is there any literature that portrays him in a Byzantine likeness. The explanation for this disparity is to be found elsewhere, in Jaroslav's Varangian affiliations that will be addressed in the following chapter.

Byzantine written sources furnish images of Vladimir and Jaroslav that portray them as rulers of inferior rank in contrast to their emperors. At no time do we read that either Vladimir or Jaroslav, or even one of the intermediate princes, had been conferred a noble distinction above the rank of *ἄρχων* that could be rendered as the equivalent of prince in the tenth-eleventh-century context. Repeatedly, the Byzantine accounts of Kedrenos and Psellos,¹⁰³ the *Ἐπιτομὴ ἱστοριῶν* of the chronicler Ioannes Zonaras in the early twelfth century,¹⁰⁴ and the fourteenth-century source of the historian Nikephoros Gregoras¹⁰⁵ along with his contemporary and rival the emperor Ioannes VI Kantakouzenos (1347–1354),¹⁰⁶ record this basic rank. But as Obolensky stresses:¹⁰⁷

It would perhaps be unwise, in view of the linguistic traditionalism of the Byzantines, to attach too much significance to the recurrence of those technical terms. Yet such was the continuity of the Romano-Byzantine institutions that it seems by no means impossible that the Byzantines still thought of their satellites in terms of Roman administration; and that the position within the *Oikoumene* [that is, the Christian world] of these satellites, theoretically subject to the emperor, independent in practice, may to some extent be understood in the light of the Roman conception of 'foederatio,' which expresses the status of the Empire's subject allies. In this manner Byzantium could

¹⁰³ Kedrenos 2: 444 and 551; and Psellos, pp. 199 ff.; and the Renauld edition, 2: 8 ff.

¹⁰⁴ Ioannes Zonaras, *Ἐπιτομὴ ἱστοριῶν*, ed. L. Dindorf, 4 (Leipzig, 1871): 114. For the life and literature on Zonaras, cf. Moravcsik, 1: 344–346; and A. Kazhdan, "Zonaras, John," *ODB* 3: 2229.

¹⁰⁵ Nikephoros Gregoras, *Ἱστορία Ῥωμαϊκή*, ed. L. Schopen, 1–2 (Bonn, 1829–1830); and 3, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1855), *passim*; and *Correspondance de Nicéphore Grégoras*, ed. R. Guiland (Paris, 1927). Cf. the bibliographical commentaries upon his works in Krumbacher, 1: 293–298; Moravcsik, 1: 450–453; and Alice-Mary Talbot, "Gregoras, Nikephoros," *ODB* 2: 874–875.

¹⁰⁶ Ioannes Kantakouzenos, *Ἱστορία*, ed. J. Schopen, 1–3 (Bonn, 1828–1832), *passim*. Cf. Krumbacher, 1: 298–300; and Moravcsik, 1: 321–323.

¹⁰⁷ Obolensky, "Principles and Methods," p. 58.

safeguard its universal claims, without being obliged to press them too far, while the 'barbarians,' gaining a new prestige from their legal association with the Empire, could preserve their political autonomy.

He then adds:¹⁰⁸

The association of the 'barbarians' with the Empire was further expressed by the bestowal upon their rulers of titles taken from the hierarchy of the Byzantine court. The purpose of such titles was threefold: to flatter the vanity of the Imperial satellites; to bind them to the Empire by a relationship of dependence; and to signify the particular rank occupied by the given ruler and his people with the *Oikoumene*.

Byzantine concepts of Roman administration and their practical application of granting court titles were demonstrated in 1043. Kedrenos titles Jaroslav's son Vladimir as a *κατάρχων*, the Latin equivalent of which is *sub-regulus*. The term could denote a subruler below the rank of king, perhaps a petty king, or more precisely the son of a king, thus implying that he would have or had some station within the Rus' administration according to Roman ideas then current in Constantinople.¹⁰⁹ The Byzantines did not deny to the Rus' nor challenge the existence of monarchy within their realm. This is evidenced in Kedrenos's notations for 1036, when he discusses briefly the death of Mstislav, but recognized the existence of monarchy and its legitimacy as a political institution within the Kievan principality.¹¹⁰

But what emerges from this examination is a carefully crafted articulation of the importance of Byzantium and its ideals to Europe and not simply to the Balkan Slav states and Kievan Rus'. Christian Raffensperger has prudently articulated the Byzantine ideal. He writes:¹¹¹

The existence in Byzantine imperial ideology of a 'family hierarchy' headed by the Byzantine emperor reflected Byzantine belief, but not necessarily political reality, though most honored Byzantium's cultural heritage and position as the continuation of the Roman Empire. The essence of the Byzantine Ideal is that Byzantium, as the last vestige of the Roman Empire, exerted an ideological or cultural force on the kingdoms of medieval Europe as they were establishing themselves and their dynasties, and those kingdoms then endeavored to connect themselves in some way to Byzantium and through Byzantium to Rome in order to enhance their own legitimacy.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Kedrenos 2: 551. Cf. Zonaras 4: 121, who also applies the title to Vladimir for the year 1043 entry.

¹¹⁰ Kedrenos 2: 515. Cf. Zonaras 4: 105.

¹¹¹ Ch. 1, esp. pp. 11–12.

The period encompassing the rules of Vladimir and Jaroslav illustrates the inculcation, though unevenly, into Kievan Rus' of the Byzantine religious and political thought world. The Rus' did not of necessity by virtue of their Byzantine religious conversion have to fall within the intellectual purview of Constantinople, but tenth-eleventh century custom dictated that this would be so. Thus the Kievan Rus' by virtue of their conversion gained an imprecise Christian notion of monarchy and of the powers of their prince. Prompted by feelings of preserving their identity and independence, the Rus' moved with caution into the political orbit and religious sphere of Constantinople; hence on the one hand they were willing to elevate their standing among nations and took steps to assure this gain, while on the other hand they demonstrated their aloofness to and independence from the Byzantine political orbit by taking up occasional arms against the empire. Only the Byzantines consistently believed that the Rus' were their subject allies and came under the authority, both religious and political, of the emperor.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DECLINE OF THE VARANGIANS

To the accession of Vladimir I, the Northmen had played a noteworthy role in northern Rus' in the consolidation of Eastern Slavic tribes into a loosely organized state, but the solitary rule of the Riurikids was regionally limited and subject to clashes with rival Varangian clans. Their fortunes to the time of Vladimir's baptism were gauged by their military exploits and mercantile accomplishments. While the Scandinavian tradition remained a strong force in some Kievan regional areas, the Varangians lost little of their luster for martial exploits or trading acumen. On the other hand, Nordic political and religious thought and practices, and their very culture were more primitive in their structure and development than the Byzantine. And the ingredients and ideals associated with the Scandinavian heritage were not uniform; hence we encounter inconsistencies in their definition of rulership and its image. The early Rus' scribes, though moved by their Christian ideals, do not attempt with deliberateness to efface completely this pagan political tradition; rather, they seek to disguise the sources of princely power without clear attributions to their Scandinavian roots while preserving an essential Varangian image of rulership.

A crucial issue arising in Kievan historiographic thought is the question of the source of princely sovereign authority. Did it emanate from the Rus' scribes readings of the Old and New Testaments and hence enter the principality upon its Christianization; or did this aspectual quality of rulership enter the Kievan land by way of Byzantium through the inculcation of Greek laws and religious teachings; or was there present in pre-Kievan Rus' an expression of commonality of political ideals, rooted in the Varangian pagan past, but also traditionally acknowledged by most Indo-European peoples? We have addressed the first two parts of this question in the previous chapters. It is the third portion that merits scrutiny and critical attention at this juncture. *НБЛ* speaks of Vladimir having established his unitary rule in 980¹ over the lands then comprising the Kievan principality. This source implies

¹ *НБЛ* 1: 79; and 2: 56. Cf. *supra*, pp. 13 ff. and accompanying notes.

the presence of sovereign authority as a result of the fact that Vladimir had assumed rule by the right of conquest and some years after his conversion to Christianity, the same annalists are prompted to demonstrate that he was “the elect of God” and his sovereignty was derived and directed from above.² Again, with the onset of Jaroslav’s sole rule in 1036, the scribes of *PIRA* relate to us that the prince “aspired for all his powers” and was the “autocrat” of the Rus’ land.³

The notion of sovereignty is common to Scandinavian political thought. The earliest major Scandinavian sources speak of this aspect of rulership and the *Ynglinga Saga*,⁴ a semi-legendary account compiled by Icelandic scribes very early in the second Christian millennium or at the close of the previous thousand-year cycle, is representative of this genre. The *Saga*, though written in a turgid literary style with its consequent aberrations, elaborates upon the evolution of the Northmen’s political and social organization and of their rulers’ powers. These early Nordic tribes did not require sovereign authority as an essential characteristic of rulership. At this primitive, but pagan, stage that appears to coincide with the inculcation of rudimentary Christian thought, Norse chieftains achieved tribal leadership through distinguished acts of bravery, were noted for their skill in safeguarding the domain from foreign conquests, and were recognized for their ability to make worthy sacrifices to the gods, thus bringing divine favors upon the ruler and the ruled.⁵

Scandinavian society advanced in stages from a clan/tribal structure to higher forms of civilized society through a maturate process—a growth noticeable among many of the leading Indo-European peoples at this stage in their history. In the progression of Norse political society the *Ynglinga Saga* relates that the high chieftain became known as a *drott* (sovereign) and simultaneously his people accepted the notion that the kin of the gods had begot him.⁶ The idea of sovereignty developed from the political expectations of the people—their need for solitary leadership generally in time of military conflicts that were frequent and the knowledge that the gods through the agency of a semi-divine being would protect the community

² Ibid., 1: 127; and 2: 111. Cf. *supra*, pp. 45–46, and esp. n. 111, for variants on this phrase.

³ Ibid., 1: 150. For variants and *lacunae* in the Rus’ annals subsequent to this source, cf. *supra*, pp. 59–60, esp. n. 156.

⁴ Snorri Sturluson (Monsen edition), pp. 1–35; and the Hollander translation, pp. 6–50.

⁵ Ibid. (Monsen edition, unless otherwise noted), p. 6.

⁶ Ibid.

and provide for its needs. Although a Nordic ruler acquired the distinction of sovereign, his authority was minimalized and not supreme within his kin. The chief limitation upon the concept of sovereignty and an inherent weakness that repeatedly appears in the attempted consolidation of Scandinavian territories by ambitious would-be supreme rulers was the preponderant Norse belief that all freemen of their political society deemed themselves to be the equals of one another, therefore, the *drott* was the *primus inter pares*, even though he had been begotten by the kin of the gods. Further, since there existed rivalry, often intense, for preeminence among the freemen and even the gods who favored them, the latter frequently involving themselves in human affairs much as the gods in ancient Greek mythology, there was a reluctance among the Norsemen to submit themselves to the rule of a single individual. This flaw in the Nordic concept of sovereignty provides an explanation why in the later medieval period there existed as a characteristic feature of their society the notion that freemen had the right and privilege to serve whichever sovereign they wished, and the Norse and later the Varangians in Rus' history had license to serve a prince so long as he had need for them or they for him. In 980, when Vladimir began to reign alone in Kiev, the Varangians who had assisted him in the capture of the city sought payment for their services. *ПВЛ* records the Varangian petition to the Kievan prince:⁷

ЕЕ ГРАДА НАШЕ· И МЫ ПРИНХОМОМЪ Е· ДА ХОЧЕМЪ ИМАТИ ОКУПЪ НА НИХ· ПО·Ѣ· ГРИВНѢ
 ѿ ЧЛѢКА· И РЕ ИМ ВОЛОДМЕРЪ ПОЖДЕТЕ· ДАЖЕ ВЫ КУНЫ СБЕРУТЬ ЗА МЦЬ· [И] ЖДАША
 ЗА МѢСАЦЬ И НЕ ДАСТЬ ИМЪ· И РѢША ВАРАНЖИ СОЛЪСТАТЬ ЕИ НАМИ· ДА ПОКАЖИ НИ
 ПУТЬ ВЪ ГРЕКИ· ОНЪ ЖЕ РЕ ИМЪ НАДЕТЕ·

This town is ours and we have taken it. We wish to put redemption upon them [the Kievans] according to two *grivny* from [each] man. And Vladimir asked them to wait in order that they would collect in marten [skins] within a month. They waited a month and he gave them nothing. And so the Varangians said: '[You] have deceived us. Show us the way to the Greeks.' He said to them: 'Go!'

Mutual fealty was recognized as a reciprocal obligation between the Kievan prince and the Varangians as long as Vladimir fulfilled his duties to them

⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 78–79; 2: 66, with minor emendations; similar to *ПВЛ–И*, *И*, 3: 127–128; *И*₄, almost like *ПВЛ–Д*, 4: 55–56; *С*, 5: 112, as *ПВЛ–И*; also *В*, 7: 293–294; *ПН*, 9: 40, like *ПВЛ–И*; with substantial elision and some emendation, *Т*, 15: 72, but appears to be influenced by *ПВЛ–И*; the passage does not appear in *В*, 21/1; nor is there a reference in *Вл*; and *НК*, 42: 43, like *ПВЛ–И*. *Ник* (Zenkovsky), 1: 76; the passage is excised from *П*; and *Тр* (Priselkov), p. 93, like *ПВЛ–И*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 93; and *БЛДР*, 1: 126–127, but like *ПВЛ–И*.

and once he violated his pledge to recompense them for their services, whether in coin or kind, the men were no longer constrained to demonstrate their displeasure and to terminate unilateral obedience. Clearly, the prince had forfeited all claims to fealty. Two factors may have led to the onset of this crossroad in relations. First, Vladimir may have lacked sufficient financial means to recompense them since he had just then taken Kiev and its treasury was bare; and the second factor may have been that he no longer had need for retaining a large mercenary force for his conquests, and sought to release from service a substantial number of Varangians, among other recruits.

The inherent weakness noted previously in the notion of the *drott* being restricted to a position of *primus inter pares* with the freemen facilitated his removal as a ruler and the right of deposition remained a key ingredient of medieval Nordic political thought. If the *drott* demonstrated attributes of failure or a lack of strength in his character in whatever undertaking, if he failed to provide adequate security for his people against their enemies, if the harvest was poor, or if some other harm befell the kin, then his peers within the political community could sit in judgment to establish whether or not he had failed to appease the gods and therefore had brought calamity upon the community's members. If he was adjudged to be responsible for the outcome, it was then decided to sacrifice him to appease a divinity.⁸

Only one application of the right of deposition in the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian epoch shows traces of this essential Nordic principle, but in a more common Christianized form. The Rus' annalists who drew upon the injunction of Isaiah repudiated Svjatopolk's claim to Kievan sovereignty.⁹ The injunction is based on the grounds that

... God grants authority to whomever He wishes, for He appoints emperors and higher princes. The Almighty gives [authority] to whomever he desires. If such a land is justified before God, He establishes in it a just Caesar or prince who loves law and justice, and He sets up a governor and a judge who administer the law. For if the princes are righteous in the land, then many sins [of the land] are remitted. But if they are evil and deceitful, then God brings upon the land a greater evil because he is the head of the land.

⁸ Snorri Sturluson (Monsen edition), pp. 6–10.

⁹ *ICPI* 1: 139–140; and 2: 126–127. For the full cited Slavonic and translated text, cf. *supra*, pp. 53–54; and for the variant and omitted texts, cf. p. 53, n. 137. Additionally, for the Rus' annalists' denunciation of Svjatopolk's claim to sovereignty over the Kievan lands, see *supra*, pp. 51–56.

The *ПВА* variation upon this Nordic theme of sovereign deposition is that the former source grants this right to the populace and paradoxically only the inhabitants of the town of Kiev without class or social distinction who are enjoined to denounce Svjatopolk's claim to princely power in Kiev.¹⁰ The *Ynglinga Saga* confers the privilege of deposition exclusively upon the freemen.¹¹ The Rus' annalistic renditions of the depositional sanction contain a further corruption. The sacrificial requirement for a condemned *drott* is substituted in *ПВА* with the exercise of divine judgment and wrath, and thus pursued by God:¹²

ПРЕВѢЖА В ПУСТЫНЮ· МЕЖЮ ЛАХУ И ЧЕХУ· НЕПРОВѢРЖЕ ЗЛѢ ЖИВОТЪ СВОИ [В ТОМЪ МѢСТЕ]·

He [Svjatopolk] came to the wilderness between the Liakhs and Czechs. [In this place] his evil life was reduced.

By the ninth century, the term *konungr* (another textual variation is *kon- ingr* or *konungar*, however, in Old Scandinavian, the term is rendered as *kœnugarðr*) supplanted *drott* as a royal distinction in common Scandinavian usage and the new title was deemed to be an honor worthy of the highest esteem,¹³ retaining however the essential qualities identified with the *drott*. *Konungr* is a North Germanic (Nordic) derivation of the proto-Germanic **kuningaz*.¹⁴ Between the seventh and ninth centuries Teutonic and other

¹⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 132; 2: 118; *Н*₁, 3: 169; *Н*₄, 4: 105; *С*₁, 5: 125; *В*, 7: 318; *ПН*, 9: 70; *Т*, 15: 123; *НК*, 42: 58; and *Тр*, pp. 122–123. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 126; and *БЛДР*, 1: 182–183.

¹¹ Snorri Sturluson, pp. 6–10.

¹² *ПСРЛ* 1: 145; 2: 132, with minor terminological alterations and emendations; *Н*₁, 3: 175, erroneously cites the year of flight as 1016, and reads: И БѢЖА СВЯТОПОЛКЪ В ПЕЧЕНѢГЫ, И БЫТЬ МЕЖИ ЧАХУ И ЛАХУ, НИКИМ ЖЕ ГОНИМЪ ПРОПАДЕ ОКАННЫИ, И ТАКО ЗЛѢ ЖИВОТ СВОИ СКОИЧА ..., "And Svjatopok fled to the Pechenegs, he being between the Czechs and Liakhs. The vileness defiled not one of the persecuted. And in this way his evil life ended ...;" *Н*₄, 4: 109, renders an addition to the passage to read: И ПРЕВѢЖЕ В ПУСТЫНЮ, МЕЖЮ ЧАХУ И ЛАХУ — О СВЯТОПОЛЧЕН ПРОПАДЕНИИ — ТУ НЕПРОВѢРЖЕ ЗЛѢ ЖИВОТЪ СВОИ, "He [Svjatopolk] came to the wilderness, between the Czechs and Liakhs—Concerning Svjatopolk's disappearance—His evil life was reduced here;" very similar to *Н*₄; *С*₁, 5: 133; so also *В*, 7: 327; as well *ПН*, 9: 76; also *Т*, 15: 139; but not cited in *К*, *В*₁, and *НК*. *ННК* (Zenkovsky), 1: 134, reads: "... chased by the wrath of God, he [Svjatopolk] ran through the Polish land and crossed the wilderness between Bohemia and Poland, and there he ended his wicked life;" but excised from *П*; and *Тр* (Priselkov), p. 130. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 133; and *БЛДР*, 1: 188–189.

¹³ Snorri Sturluson, pp. 6–10.

¹⁴ *КНАЗЬ*, on the other hand, is a loan-word or borrowing from the proto-Germanic **kuningaz*. Cf. M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1 (Heidelberg, 1950): 581. The contention of A.G. Preobrazhensky, *Этимологический словарь Русского языка*, 1 (Moscow, 1959): 324, that *КНАЗЬ* derives from *kuning* is linguistically unacceptable. While philologists

European scribes generally accepted that *konungr*, as *kuning* and *kuningaz*, was the equivalent of *rex* and hence the sources for this period see no need to distinguish between the special degree or sense of sovereignty practiced by one ruler in contrast to another. The surrogation of *rex* for another royal distinction appears in the 839 entry in the *Annales Bertiniani*,¹⁵ the second section of this work however being compiled by Bishop Prudentius of Tries who observed the arrival from Constantinople and the stay of Rus' envoys at Ingelheim.¹⁶ The Rus', according to Prudentius, had first visited the imperial city where they conferred with the Byzantine emperor Theophilos (829–842), but with little evident success. They had come to Constantinople in *amicitiae causa*, seeking to establish more favorable trade relations with the Byzantines and to settle some merchant-warriors in the foreign quarter of the imperial city. Theophilos was not prepared to grant them improved or advantageous commercial privileges nor did he desire to disrupt his relations with neighboring states, a number of whom had thus far demonstrated that they were useful and worthy allies.

On the pretext that their safety was threatened by an undesignated foe should they seek to return northward to Kiev or elsewhere along the northern Pontic littoral, Theophilos dispatched the Rus' along with a letter of introduction to the court of Louis II the German (814–840) at Ingelheim,

differ in their interpretations, the opinions of historians also remain divided on the etymological origins of *князь* and the degree of authority connoted with this distinction. S.M. Soloviev, *История России*, 1: 282–285, gives extensive attention to the source of the term and believes that it has its origin in the Sanskrit *janaka*. He further elaborates that the powers of the *князь*, *konungr*, and *janaka* are comparable. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, p. 178, drawing upon the investigations and findings of Preobrazhensky, argues in favor of the notion that the Slavic term for prince is of much later derivation, from the "old German *kuning* (in old Norse, *konungr*)" Vernadsky, probably seeking to preserve a Slavic milieu, does not attempt to derive the powers of a *князь* from either a *kuning* or a *konungr*. A.V. Solov'ev, "Reges' et 'Regnum Russiae' au moyen âge," *Byz* 36 (1965): 145, appears to be imprecise when examining the usage of *князь*. He states: "On sait le mot slave *künędz* n'est qu'un emprunt du *kuning* goth. Un *konungr* scandinave peut bien être appelé en russe *knjaz*, et inversement un *knjaz*' peut être qualifié de *konungr* et de *rex*." For a further discussion of the authority of the *князь*, cf. *infra*, cf. ch. 5.

¹⁵ *MGH, Scriptores*, ed. G.H. Pertz, 1 (Hannover, 1826): 419–515. See also the edition of G. Waitz (Hannover, 1883).

¹⁶ For additional literature on the Rus' visit, cf. S. Gedeonov, *Варяги и Русь. Историческое исследование*, 2 (St. Petersburg, 1876): 483–505; T.S. Arne, *La Suède et l'orient. Etudes archéologiques sur les relations de la Suède et de l'orient pendant l'âge des Vikings* (Uppsala, 1914), pp. 6–17; N. de Baumgarten, *Aux Origines de la Russie*, OCA 119 (Rome, 1939): 7–8; and E.E. Lipshits, "О походе Руси на Византию ранее 842 года," *ИЗ* 26 (1948): 312–331.

where their arrival and stay was recorded and supposedly their identity was established. At Ingelheim steps were also taken to make provision for their safe return to Scandinavia. However, the arrival of the Rus' envoys did cause Louis some uneasiness and raised his suspicions as to the true identity and intent of these merchant-warriors. Whether Theophilos conveyed these suspicions in his letter to Louis is not made clear in the *Annales Bertiniani*. Bishop Prudentius notes that Louis ascertained that ... *Rhos vocari dicebant* ..., "they say they are called Rus;" and ... *gentis esse Sueonum* ..., "they are of Swedish descent."¹⁷ And in further investigating the nature of their background, Prudentius notes that Louis established that ... *rex illorum, Chacanus vocabulo* ..., "their king is called *khagan*."¹⁸ Two interpretations of *Chacanus* are plausible. First, B.S. Benedikz maintains that "Chagonos" [*sic*] is the Scandinavian equivalent for the proper name Hakon. Linguistically, his interpretation and rendering of the term is persuasive. However, nowhere in his essay does he furnish an explanation for his reasoning, nor is one readily apparent from the text of this work.¹⁹ Second, the use of parallel titles—*rex* and *Chacanus*—illustrates the Latin writer's belief, even if mistakenly, that these were distinctions of equivalent rank and each conveyed similar degrees of authority. But the recording of the term *Chacanus* leads to the suspicion that the Northmen, unless they were pursuing a deceptive course intending to mislead, may have admitted to the nominal suzerainty of the Khazar *khagan* at Itil and therefore adopted for their own *konungr* the substitutive title of *khagan*.²⁰ Yet, the paucity of written evidence and

¹⁷ *MGH, Scriptores*, 1: 434. Cf. H. Lowmiański, *Zagadnienie roli Normanów w genezie państw słowiańskich* (Warsaw, 1957), pp. 133–136; D. Obolensky, "The Byzantine Sources on the Scandinavians in Eastern Europe," *S-S, Supplementum 1: Varangian Problems* (Copenhagen, 1970): 149 f.; and Hrushevsky, "Excursus 2: The Normanist Theory," 1: 472–492. Though dated, but still of interpretative use is the article of A.V. Riasanovsky, "The Embassy of 838 Revisited: Some Comments in Connection with a 'Normanist' Source on Early Russian History," *JGO* 10 (1962): esp. 2–6 and 8–12. He is correct in asserting that the term *khagan* is of oriental origin and often used to identify the rulers of numerous nations. He also without question equates the Latin *Chacanus* with the Asiatic *khagan*. On the other hand, Riasanovsky as many Russian scholars from a nationalistic viewpoint treat the term as a perjorative, disparaging the idea that Scandinavians would have a link to the early political formation of the Kievan Rus' state. They admit the commercial role of the Varangians in traversing their waterways en route to Byzantium, but seek to deny to them a political role.

¹⁸ *MGH, Scriptores*, 1: 434.

¹⁹ B.S. Benedikz, "The Evolution of the Varangian Regiment in the Byzantine Army," *BZ* 62 (1969): 20–24.

²⁰ Shepard, "The Origins of Rus," *CHR*, 1: 49–50, interprets the term *chacanus* to be a proper name for the leader of these people. He adds further, *ibid.*, p. 52: "There is thus some

the lack of sufficient reliable sources makes it difficult to arrive at any firm or far-reaching conclusion on this event regarding the interchangeability of these noble titles and the implications that one might derive from such parallel usage. And yet, the more plausible rendering is that of Benedikz.

The Nordic *konungr* should be distinguished from *rex*, not only in its derivation and meaning, but also in the degree of authority conferred on the royal claimant. The sovereignty and powers of a *rex* were supreme and were admitted to be superior to those of the *konungr*, who made no claim to absolute authority. Some *reges* on occasion demonstrated pretensions to universal sovereignty, while the authority of the *konungr* remained regionalized. The *konungr* was a paternal head and procreator of a family, and he was the king of his own kin, clan, or people. Notice of a strong parallel here with the image of a *κῆρυξ* is unavoidable. Thus Scandinavian kingship should then be interpreted as national in character, whereas the *konungr* remains only the representative of his political unit, though possessing sacrosanct qualities that he inherited as an offspring of a divinity. The *konungr*, however, enjoyed no absolute theocratic powers generally associated with the titles of *rex* or *βασιλεύς*.

The impact of Scandinavian political thought upon the conceptualization of a Kievan notion of rulership produced inconsistent results. Within the compass of their lawmaking powers, neither the *drott* nor the *konungr* was absolute in the issuance of legislative norms. Traditionally, a Scandinavian ruler had the primary responsibility by virtue of his office to issue laws reflective of the administrative and religious needs of his kin. Should legal arguments arise among the freemen of the community, these juridical disputations were resolved according to the ancient standards established through oral customary law. But the right of the *drott* and later the *konungr* to promulgate arbitrary laws was limited by the institution of the *Thing*, a council of freemen who had gained the privilege to supplement and to modify the legal prescriptions of the ruler.²¹ Though a Scandinavian sovereign

congruence between the Frankish annals' indication of a Scandinavian 'people' headed by a khagan and the chronicle's tale of the native peoples' covenant with 'Varangians';" and he places "the khagan of the Northmen" about Lake Il'men', to the south of Novgorod. For the *chaganum ... Northmannorum*, cf. Louis II, "Epistola ad Basilium I," *MGH, Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 5 (Berlin, 1928): 388. Cf. E. Kunik, *Die Berufung der schwedischen Rodsen durch die Finnen und Slawen. Eine Vorarbeit zur Entstehungsgeschichte des russischen Staates*, 2 (St. Petersburg, 1845): 195–284.

²¹ Snorri Sturluson, p. 6. On the lawmaking authority of the *konungr*, cf. *Corpus Juris Sueo-Gotorum Antiqui*, eds. H.S. Collin and J. Schlyter, 1 (Stockholm, 1827): 36–41.

was exalted in his royal rank and enjoyed the blessings of a pagan deity, he was checked in the establishment and exercise of his legal authority by a human institution. The *drott*, as his successor the *konungr*, was bound to the law and hence not above it. This fundamental Nordic notion of placing a limitation upon the lawmaking powers of a ruler is in consonance with early Judaic thought. Thus the compilers of *PRÅ*, aware of the Scandinavian roots of the Riurikid house, could employ an Old Testament acrostic about a virtuous wife²² who weaves for her husband scarlet robes, and draw a parallel stressing that a distinguished ruler sits in council with his elders and the inhabitants of his domain. The Northmen, the Kievan Rus', and the Hebrews of the Old Testament, therefore, exercised a common prerogative of ancient precedence—the right to restrict the legal powers of a sovereign and to subject him to the law. In Byzantine political thought, however, the *βασιλεύς* stands above the law, but even he graciously submits himself to its governance and does not attempt to rule in a capricious and tyrannical manner, being aware of the dire consequences that might befall him, although their history provides sufficient examples that this principle was not always heeded and Byzantine emperors fell to the sword or other forms of deposition. Yet, in the Kievan principality, notwithstanding its Christianization, the Nordic and not the Byzantine notion explained the relational character between the prince and the law.

When, in 1015, Jaroslav rebelled against the authority of his father and began to recruit an army composed in large part of Varangian warriors, although the sources provide clear evidence that he included Slavs in his military force, the prince of Novgorod set out to seize the Kievan seat and to bring its lands under his authority. Here we encounter two aspects of historical significance for that year. First, Jaroslav receives the condescension of Rus' annalist for his rebellion against the revered Vladimir, explaining their ill treatment in acknowledging and minimizing his accomplishments thereafter; and second, the role of Varangians in Kievan society is reduced to that of the status of mercenaries, granting to them no political significance in the further evolution of the Kievan state.

The following year Jaroslav seized Kiev and established himself upon the seat of his father. The new prince, having secured his authority, released all of his warriors and undertook an official action:²³

²² Cf. *supra*, p. 30 and n. 65.

²³ Археографическая Комиссия, *Новгородская Летопись по Синодальному Хартийному списку* (St. Petersburg, 1888), p. 84.

ДАВЪМ ПРАВДУ, И УСТАВЪ СПИСАВЪ, ТАКО РЕКШИ НМЪ: ПО СЕИ ГРАМОТЕ ХОДИТЕ; ИАКОЖЕ
СПИСАХЪ ВАМЪ, ТАКОШЕ ДЕРЖИТЕ.

He gave them a law, and having written a code, thus [he] said to them: 'Go according to this charter, which I wrote for you, [and] so abide [by it].

This primary code, designated the *Русская Правда* [*The Rus' Law*],²⁴ is based upon customary laws shared in common by Northmen and Eastern Slavs inhabiting the Kievan state. The *Русская Правда* contains mainly norms of penal law, which vary according to social standing and the relative importance of the crime. The Varangians may have possessed a deeper respect for a written code than the Eastern Slavs, although the latter, as early as 860 when they extended an invitation to Riurik and his kin to organize the administrative and legal system of northern Rus', recognized the value of having common juristic norms.²⁵ It is quite probable that the Varangians and Slavs who served Jaroslav were familiar with the Nordic *sak-tal*, a code of common law establishing a *wer* or *wergeld* on a man's life, fixing penalties for every man according to his birth and rank, and awarding to his claimant

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 84–88. The text of this code does not appear in all redactions of the *Novgorod Chronicle* and it is altogether excised from *ПВЛ*. A rendition of the *Rus' Law* appears only in *Н₁, ПСПЛ* 3: 177–180. The most comprehensive and current textual collection of the *Русская Правда*, with annotations, textual discussions, and a facsimile edition, is the three-volume work edited by B.D. Grekov, *Правда Русская* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1940–1963). For extensive commentaries and analyses of the textual renditions, cf. D'iakonov, *Очерки*, pp. 33–48; V.I. Sergeevich, *Лекции и исследования по древней истории русского права* (4th ed., St. Petersburg, 1910), pp. 46–103; I. Stratonov, "К вопросу о составе и происхождении краткой редакции Русской Правды," *ИОАИЕКУ* 30/4 (1920): 385–424; Presniakov, *Лекции* 1: 130 ff.; M.N. Tikhomirov, "Русская Правда. (К 200-летию открытия памятника)," *И-М* 5 (1938): 138–155; S.V. Iushkov, "Русская Правда как кодекс русского феодального права," *ПСЛ* 4–5 (1939): 72–89; M.N. Tikhomirov, *Русская Правда* (Moscow, 1941); B.D. Grekov, "На заре русского государства," *ИЖ* 7 (1942): 22–23; *idem*, *Крестьяне на Руси с древнейших времен до XVII века* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1946), pp. 111–127; Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 78 and 292 ff.; *idem*, *Medieval Russian Laws, Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies* 41 (New York, 1947; repr. 1929), pp. 26–56; *A History of Russian Economic Thought: Ninth through Eighteenth Centuries*, ed. J.M. Letiche, et al. (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964), pp. 37 ff.; Novosel'tsev, pp. 131–146; Romanov, pp. 24–31; and Nazarenko, pp. 116–123, 158–161, 173–177, 187–189, 194–202, 204–211, 215–218, and *passim*. On the similarity of the *Русская Правда* to other contemporary codes, cf. S. Pokrovsky, "Салическая правда и ее сходство с русской правдой," *СГ* 5 (1936): 105–114; S.V. Iushkov, "Правосудие Митрополичье," *ЛЗАК* 35 (1929): 115–120; Tikhomirov, *Пособие*, pp. 127–129; and the "Discussion" in *ASEER* 31 (1972): 257–295, with contributions of S. Kucherov, "Indigenous and Foreign Influences on the Early Russian Legal Heritage," note esp. pp. 268–282; of O.P. Backus III, "Legal Analysis and the History of Early Russian Law;" and of D.P. Hammer, "The Character of the *Russkaia Pravda*."

²⁵ *ПСЛ* 1: 19; and *ibid.*, 2: 14. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 59; and *БДР* 1: 74–75.

compensation, *mannbot*, for every injury due to the party harmed, or to his family and next of kin. A *sak-tal* had been promulgated in the reign of Halvdan (Halfdan) the Black, the king of Norway (820–860), and his code appears to have influenced much of Scandinavia and even the English-speaking areas to the west.²⁶ The Novgorodians demonstrated their familiarity with the *sak-tal*, hence partially explaining their invitation to Riurik and his kin who could introduce in addition political and economic stability to the region. But as we have previously observed, Riurik and his kin came to rule parts of northern Rus' and other Varangian elements also had control over specified areas. This negated the rule of a monolithic Varangian leadership over all Rus' lands and led to repeated conflicts and the ultimate weakening of Varangian domination in Kievan Rus', relegating them mainly to the role of mercenaries hired for specific martial needs.

Jaroslav's legal charter has some similarities to the *Salic Law*²⁷ and other Frankish codes, but as Vernadsky stresses:²⁸

Many a parallel may be found in the Slavic and Frankish (or the Anglo-Saxon) court procedure, penal law, the role of the guild, and so on. It would be a mistake, however, to attribute the existence of all those parallels and similarities to the influence, at that early stage, of the Germanic law on the Slavic, or vice versa. The similarity must have been chiefly the result of the similarity in general conditions of life, in social organization, as well as in tribal mentality at a given stage of the historical progress of each of the two ethnic groups, rather than that of a conscious imitation on the part of either of them.

The *Русская Правда* demonstrates that the Kievan state existed for the realization of the law and the authority of the state was the means for enforcing the common law. Thus Jaroslav was dependent on a law that was superior to him as prince and upon whose existence his rule was based. The Varangians and Slavs who aided him in his rise to power sought to preserve and to maintain an established order according to normative codes with which they were familiar. The *Русская Правда*, therefore, took into consideration only the preservation of a juristic system based upon the

²⁶ Snorri Sturluson, p. 40. About 890 in England similar provisions of *wer* or *wergeld* and compensation for loss or losses were incorporated by King Alfred into the *Wessex Law*. Cf. *Select Charters and Other Illustrations: English Constitutional History from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward the First*, ed. W. Stubbs (9th ed., Oxford, 1913), pp. 69–72. Note also Backus, p. 287.

²⁷ For the text of the *Salic Law*, cf. H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, 1 (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1906): 427–442.

²⁸ Vernadsky, *Medieval Russian Laws*, p. 3.

laws of one's father and grandfather. Neither the Rus' annalists nor the ecclesiastical literary apologists showed opposition to secular customary law and *PRAD* on the occasion of Vladimir's issuance of a church statute in 996 admonished the prince for his failure to punish robbers. Yet further, he is advised to administer due process of law according to the prescriptions of his father and grandfather.²⁹

These same writers, nevertheless, understood that common law made no provision for advancing social betterment and civilization, and in particular for the improvement of the religious concerns of society. Perhaps we might find herein an explanation for the momentary ecstasy of the *PRAD* compilers who record in the entries for 1036 and 1037 Jaroslav's non-legalistic achievements—his introduction into the Kievan state of Byzantine religious and legal writings with their parallel stress upon eleemosynary activities, and the prince's construction of centers of learning.³⁰ The Rus' churchmen then found hope in his brief departure from the rigid juristic approach stressing personal and property values, and took safety in the notion that Jaroslav would move away from his Scandinavian inclinations and bind himself to social and Christian laws that were yet to be realized in the principality. This was somewhat accomplished with his issuance of a church statute in 1051.³¹

But the divine law that Kievan churchmen sought to institute and expected the princes to enforce was in principle antithetical to customary law. Often, these laws did not have the same purpose in mind. The former desired to provide guides for man's spiritual salvation, where as the latter sought to protect his material wellbeing. And church law was recently manifested in the principality and throughout the course of the reigns of Vladimir to Jaroslav it tended to challenge, if not to uproot established common legal practices that had incorporated over the centuries numerous pagan elements. The ecclesiastics then sought to provide a new definition of the relationship of the ruler to the law. The Rus' princes, on the other hand, never intended to relinquish sovereign authority to the superintendence and guidance of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, although they remained respectful of it. Had the Rus' princes succumbed to this Christian ideal of the superiority of the *sacerdotium* to the *imperium*, they would have subordinated

²⁹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 45–46.

³⁰ Cf. *supra*, pp. 61–62.

³¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 83–84.

themselves to a positive law and practiced a divine law expounded by a religious body that recognized the ecclesiastical primacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople. More important, as we have seen in the previous chapter, neither Vladimir nor Jaroslav was willing to surrender any part of their lawmaking authority to a Byzantine emperor who made claims to universal sovereignty, but rather each prince reserved for himself the lawmaking prerogative.

At the same time, the Rus' clergy did not hold common law to be unreasonable and exercised caution in repudiating it. *ПВЛ* omits from its pages the text of the *Русская Правда* and finds no need to make reference to this fundamental code. Yet, *ПВЛ* notes in an earlier entry the ecclesiastical censorship of Vladimir for his failure to preserve law and order according to the norms established by his father and grandfather. The Rus' churchmen did not visualize a great irreconcilable disparity between ecclesiastical law, which they had inherited from the Greeks, and the common law practiced by the Varangians and Slavs. They on occasion when necessitated sought to acknowledge agreement and to demonstrate their respect for secular law. *ПВЛ* relates:³²

ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ ЖЕ ОТВЕРГЪ ВРИИ НАЧА КАЗНИТИ РАЗБОНИКЫ· И РѢША ЕППИ И СТАРЦИ·
РАТЬ МНОГА ШЖЕ ВРИА ТО НА ШРУЖИ· И НА КОНИ БУДИ· И РЕ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ [ТЪ БОУ·
И ЖИВАШ ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ] ПО УСТРОЕНЮ ШТЬЮ И ДѢДИЮ·

Vladimir set aside *wergeld* [and] began to execute the robbers. And the bishops and elders said: 'War [is] frequent [and it] would be [better to use] the *wergeld* for arms and for horses.' Vladimir replied: '[It will be thus' and Vladimir lived] according to the prescriptions of [his] father and grandfather.

However, the annalists recognized only that the prince's lawmaking authority was derived from God and not from any secular tradition, and for this reason the prince was called upon to uphold the legitimate rights of his subjects, to maintain customary law, and to safeguard the possessions of the state.

There is also present a contractual aspect in the relationship of the prince to ecclesiastical and customary law. Although no contract or formal oath of

³² *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; with some orthographical alterations, 2: 111–112; with the addition of ПО УСТРОЕНЮ БОЖИЮ, "according to the prescriptions of God," in *Н*, 3: 167; excised from *Н*, 4: 96–97; *С*, 5: 123; *В*, 7: 316; the text is substantially emended in *ПН*, 9: 67; *Т*, 15: 119; and *ВЛ*, 30: 39; but excised from *К*, 21/1: 125; and *НК*, 42: 56. *ННК* (Zenkovsky), pp. 116–117, however, cites the entry for 998 and substantially alters the text; *П* (Nasonov), 1: 9, excises the passage; and *Тр* (Priselkov), pp. 119–120. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

office was required that obligated the ruler to maintain and to supplement pagan and later Christian law, and in the same manner to add to secular customary law as necessitated, a traditional understanding to do so may have been acknowledged. At an early date in Scandinavia, the *Ynglinga Saga* records the appearance of the requirement that a ruler regulate both the secular and religious relations of his kin.³³ *ПБД* relates that in the year of his accession to the seat at Kiev, Vladimir, recognizing the religious commonality achieved in matters of reciprocal interest to the Varangians and Slavs, established a shared pagan pantheon including Nordic and Slavic deities.³⁴ Too, the contractual notion implied consent between the prince and his subjects from the inception of his reign—each promising the other protection, submission, and mutual fealty without imposing an express obligation upon one or the other party.³⁵ In Nordic thought fealty was obligatory as long as the *drott* or *konungr* performed his duties. Once he erred, this requirement was nullified and his subjects were free to select another sovereign. So too, the Kievan Rus' inherited this tradition. *ПБД* does not dwell upon a secular precedence for depriving Svjatopolk of his princely office, but rather seeks to overstate the religious issues that were closely identified with his Polish marriage and father-in-law, hence the Latinizing element and its consequences for Orthodoxy. There appears the implication of sufficient evidence for fearing Svjatopolk's violation of the trust to uphold Rus' customary and Byzantine religious laws. He had an obligation to safeguard the ancient rights of the citizenry and the possessions of the state. His breach of this injunction was suitable cause for his fall from power.³⁶ The prince may have also sought to introduce Polish secular and Latin religious standards that were not harmonious with the convictions of the Rus'. Hence, a Scandinavian contractual notion was applied to facilitate his fall from authority, but the religious annalists turned to the Old Testament,³⁷ to find an illustration explaining grounds for removal and a divine sanction was invoked to move the populace of Kiev to withdraw fealty to the prince.³⁸ On the other hand, we see herein a precipitatory factor and an explanation of the need for Jaroslav

³³ Snorri Sturluson, pp. 6 ff.

³⁴ Cf. *supra*, pp. 22–23.

³⁵ F. Kern, *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages: Studies*, Studies in Mediaeval History 4 (New York, 1956), p. 121.

³⁶ Cf. *supra*, pp. 53–54.

³⁷ *Isaiah xxxii*. 1–8.

³⁸ Cf. *supra*, pp. 55–56.

to commit to writing the customary law recognized by the Varangians and Slavs who served him. His followers may have grown suspicious of oral oaths and verbal arrangements that could easily be modified or violated, and they sought a written code guaranteeing the contractual relationship between a ruler and his subjects.

The questions of legitimacy, succession, and eligibility to rule are connected to the problem of the nature of sovereignty, the relationship of the ruler to the law, and the image of the ruler that emerges as a consequence of these links. Neither the claim to undivided supreme authority nor the pretension of being above the law fell within the purview either of the *drott*, *konungr*, or the Kievan prince. According to Nordic kingship tradition, each member of a royal family had the right to be designated with the royal distinction of either *drott* or *konungr*.³⁹ This custom prevailed in Kievan Rus' and only the Riurikid offspring could be the direct heirs of the title of prince as we have previously observed when Oleg denied to Askold and Dir the right to claim a princely distinction. Further, there is no written evidence that this distinction was awarded to others outside the immediate family. However, eligibility to rule was open to each descendant by kin right and there existed no law of primogeniture that might be invoked upon the death of a *drott*, *konungr*, or even *КНЯЗЬ*. Each of their heirs was free to take his inheritance and to do with it as he pleased. Such practices complicated rulership in Scandinavia and Kievan Rus' and centrifugal tendencies were not uncommon, undermining the unity of a state. These divisive forces had no impact upon the amendment of the law and its integrity was preserved. Nor was the basic nature of sovereign rule impaired, but only the outward manifestations of rulership underwent change. Legitimacy, as a major factor, was fixed in Scandinavian usage and maintained the eligibility of each member of a royal family to hold the highest office, however he might gain this seat.

The Rus' annalists, conscious of the Scandinavian origins of the Riurikid house and yet recognizing its heirs as the legitimate sovereigns of the Kievan principality, devote attention to the crucial problems of succession and eligibility. Applying Nordic conventions and means by which a lesser prince of a royal house, though eligible but not in the direct line of succession,

³⁹ Snorri Sturluson, p. 11. In a lucid study, S.H. Cross, "Primitive Civilization of the Eastern Slavs," *ASEER* 5 (1946): 61-62, elaborates upon this Scandinavian practice and its influence upon the Kievan Rus'.

might emerge as ruler, the claim of Vladimir to the Kievan seat was not challenged by the ecclesiastical writers. Rather, detailed attention is given to explaining how by military conquest he had emerged as the sole ruler and prince of Kiev. There is no attempt by the Rus' annalists to defend the rightful claims of his half-brothers Jaropolk and Oleg,⁴⁰ perhaps because they were viewed as exponents of centrifugal rather than centripetal forces, seeking to take their inheritance of the land and to do with it as they wished. Vladimir, however, was recognized as the proponent of a unified realm under his direction that appealed to the centralizing notions of the Rus' clergy. Thus he is immediately accepted in the sources as the legitimate ruler whose eligibility to rule and right of succession are beyond reproach. The territorial divisions of the 970s introduced by Svjatoslav and upheld by his sons Jaropolk and Oleg stand in marked contrast to the partition of the principality by his grandsons Jaroslav and Mstislav. The principle of legitimacy is not questioned during the existence of the dual principalities, and the issues of eligibility and succession are set aside in the annalists' belief that they have resolved a far greater problem—the unwarranted rule of Svjatopolk. While the dual reigns of Jaroslav and Mstislav have their Norse precedents, *ПРЛ* copyists turned to the Old Testament and this ancient work furnished sufficient precedent for justifying their simultaneous rule.⁴¹

In Kievan Rus', as had been the custom in Norse lands, rulership often passed to a candidate other than the eldest direct descendant. The reigning *drott*, *konungr*, or even *князь* could and did designate a successor and this practice became common in their lands. Though inspired by the favorable heritage of the youth, Vladimir's selection of Boris and Gleb to sit as co-rulers of the principality is a leading example of the application of this Nordic custom in Kievan Rus'. But the two boys renounced their inheritance on the ground of genealogical seniority. They admitted the claim of Svjatopolk as the eldest to the princely seat and perhaps they were aware that he had the advantage of community confirmation, thus weakening any challenge they might have to his authority at the time.⁴² The notion of seniority was not a well-established principle among the Norse and its introduction into *ПРЛ* at this juncture and the authority of the Old Testament accounts of Cain and Abel lends credence to the conviction that the annalistic scribes sought to

⁴⁰ *ПСПЛ* 1: 74 ff.; and 2: 62 ff. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 90 ff.; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–125.

⁴¹ *IKings* xii. 1–xiv. 20; and *II Chronicles* x. 1–xii. 15.

⁴² *ПСПЛ* 1: 132; and 2: 118. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 126; and *БЛДР* 1: 176–177.

implement political stability in the principality and to provide for orderly succession. They sought to avoid the discord that followed with the death of Svjatoslav and introduced bloodshed for nearly a decade. But there remains an inconsistency in the annalists' rationale. They advocate the notion of the popular confirmation of a prince and stress the public following of Boris, while conversely the Rus' writers seek to disassociate Kievan succession from established Scandinavian norms, holding them in low esteem and believing them to be a cause for princely strife. The annalists were influenced by the political and ecclesiastical centralism of the Byzantine empire and believed that since the empire was divinely ordained orderly succession was a natural consequence. The *ПВЛ* account of the murder of Boris and Gleb recalls the words of the former:⁴³

... НЕ БУДИ МНѢ ВЪЗНИАТИ РУКЫ НА БРАТА СВОЕГО СТАРѢЙШАГО. АЩЕ И ОЦЬ МН
ОУМРЕ. ТО СЪ МН БУДИ ВЪ ОЦА МѢСТО.

It is not for me to raise a hand against my elder brother. If my father has died, then he [Svjatopolk] will be with me in [my] father's place.

The annal has the revered Boris upholding the principle of seniority, hence a system of successions based upon primogeniture, which was then more widely accepted throughout parts of western Europe. Again in 1026, during the formal division of the Kievan principality, Mstislav proposes to Jaroslav that, as the eldest brother, he should remain in Kiev, while the younger would establish his seat in Chernigov.⁴⁴ Boris and Mstislav then became vehicles for the Rus' writers to inaugurate a new tradition of political relationships, but this new concept lacked the force of law. The idea of seniority did not achieve exclusive importance in the decades of the 1020s and 1030s; rather, the notion that a descendant of the Riurikid house could rise to the seat at Kiev prevailed.⁴⁵

Jaroslav's *Завѣщание*, (*Testament*), confirmed the system of seniority, however, again there was wanting the strict admonition of a legal instrument. According to the *ПВЛ* text of the *Завѣщание*, Jaroslav made the following provisions for succession:⁴⁶

⁴³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 132; 2: 118; *Н₁*, 3: 170; *Н₄*, 4: 99; *С₁*, 5: 126; *В*, 7: 318–319; and *Вл*, 30: 41. The quotation is excised from *ПН*, 9: 71–72; *Т*, 15: 124; also excised from *В*, 21/1: 129–130; and *НН*, 42: 58. *Ник* (Zenkovsky), 1: 123; excised from *П* (Nasonov), 1: 9; and *Тр* (Priselkov), p. 122. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 126; and *БЛДР* 1: 176–177.

⁴⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 149; and 2: 137. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 134–135; *БЛДР*, 1: 190–191; and Novosel'tsev, pp. 154–158.

⁴⁵ Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, 1: 97–98.

⁴⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 161; 2: 150, does not include the bracketed phrase of awarding Vladimir to Igor;

СЕ ЖЕ ПОРУЧАЮ В СОВЕ МѢСТО СТОЛЪ СТАРѢЙШЕМУ СНУ МОЕМУ И БРАТУ ВАШЕМУ
 ИЗАСЛАВУ КЫЕВЪ: ЕГО ПОСЛУШАЙТЕ ЯКО ПОСЛУШАСТЕ МЕНЕ: ДА ТО ВЫ БУДЕТЬ В
 МЕНЕ МѢСТО: А СѢОСЛАВУ ДАЮ ЧЕРНИГОВЪ: А ВСЕВОЛОДУ ПЕРЕЯСЛАВЪ [А ИГОРУ
 ВОЛОДИМЕРЪ] А ВАЧЕСЛАВУ СМОЛНИСКЪ:

I entrust my place, the seat of Kiev, to my eldest son and your brother Izjaslav. Obey him as you have obeyed me, for he will be in my place [amongst] you. To Svjatoslav I give Chernigov, to Vsevolod Perejaslav!, [to Igor Vladimir], and to Vjacheslav Smolensk.

The *Testament* was not the law of the land, but a family code restricted for the use of its immediate members and introduced by Jaroslav to establish and to regulate hereafter orderly succession in the Kievan principality. This code had the additional effect of excluding other Riurikids from inheriting the princely seat and only his sons, because they are of one father and mother,⁴⁷ and their male offspring are entitled to become legitimate rulers. Thus Jaroslav abandoned the traditional kinship notion in Kievan rulership and substituted for it a concept of family rule.⁴⁸ Modern scholars have provided other interpretations explaining the purpose of the *Testament* and they are not unanimous in their examination of Jaroslav's motives. Fedotov sees this instrument as the foundation for feudal institutions in Kievan Rus'.⁴⁹ This subject is, however, beyond the scope of the chronological limits of this study, but, given the formation of feudal institutions elsewhere in Europe, merits further study and scholarly attention to whether or not this was so. Suffice it to say Fedotov's conclusion is argumentative. Kliuchevsky believes that the *Testament* was an attempt to ensure the indivisibility of princely power and to preserve the territorial integrity and entirety of the Kievan principality,⁵⁰ views to which Vernadsky also subscribes.⁵¹

Н₁, 3: 182; *Н₄*, 4: 117; *С₁*, 5: 139; *В₁*, 7: 332–333; *ПН*, 9: 85; *Т*, 15: 151; for variant texts, *К*, 21/1: 171–172; *ВЛ*, 30: 46, dates the *Testament* to 1053; and *НН*, 42: 65. For a modified rendition, *ННк* (Zenkovsky), 1: 152, that reads: “And I leave my place on the throne of Kiev to my senior son, Iziaslav, your brother; obey him just as you obeyed me, and he should lead you in my place. And I give the principality of Chernigov to Sviatoslav, and the principality of Pereiaslav’ to Vsevolod, and the principality of Vladimir to Igor, and the principality of Smolensk to Viacheslav;” excised from *Т* (Nasonov), 1: 9; and *Тр* (Priselkov), p. 140, but there is no reference to Igor’s legacy. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 142; and *БЛДР* 1: 202–203, that also excises reference to Igor’s inheritance.

⁴⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 161; and 2: 149. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 142; and *БЛДР* 1: 202–203.

⁴⁸ Presniakov, *Княжеское право*, pp. 34–36; and Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, 1: 282.

⁴⁹ Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, 1: 289.

⁵⁰ Kliuchevsky, *Курс*, 1: 97–100.

⁵¹ Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 83, 179, and 292 ff.

Florinsky, nevertheless, understands the *Testament* as implying the abandonment of the Nordic patrimonial theory of rule and a compromise with the ideals of national unity and local separatism, satisfying neither, but momentarily avoiding internecine conflicts.⁵² S.M. Soloviev believes that Jaroslav intended to create a *rota* system of succession and to preserve family rule over a large geographical area. This was to be a form of collateral seniority, prevailing among his sons and their offspring, and rule over various towns would be rotated.⁵³

Jaroslav's *Завѣщаніе* is one of the clearest examples to give evidence of the impact of Scandinavian political thought upon the Eastern Slavs. This alternate method of succession is often accepted among scholars as being a manifestation of the Germanic system of *tanistry*. Dvornik believes that this method "... had been followed by the Vandals in Africa;" although he later qualifies this judgment to note: "This system was followed also in Scotland until the eleventh century, when it gave rise to the struggle between Duncan and Macbeth and was finally ended by the sons of Duncan's son Malcolm III and St. Margaret."⁵⁴ Kern provides a much broader application and indicates that Ireland, Poland, Hungary, Serbia, the Vandal kingdoms in addition to Kievan Rus' introduced this method of succession.⁵⁵ The practice then may be neither Scandinavian nor Germanic in origin, but rather Indo-European with its roots deep in the ancient past. Throughout his lifetime, Jaroslav had maintained close ties with the leading royal houses of Scandinavia and it appears plausible that he acquired knowledge of the practice of *tanistry* during the course of his long and mutual relations with their kings, a number of whom are cited in Rus' sources as transiting Rus' and passing through Kiev on their journeys between Scandinavia and Byzantium.

A further word might be added on the affinity of the *Testament* to the law. As I have previously observed, this instrument made provision for testamentary disposition within the family and therefore was a code applicable only to Jaroslav's direct descendants. But unwittingly Jaroslav may have not foreseen that the *Завѣщаніе* was suitable in regulating rulership between father and sons, but not between brothers.⁵⁶ The consequence of Jaroslav's will was not an orderly solution to the succession question that had the force of law,

⁵² M.T. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*, 1 (New York, 1953): 24–25.

⁵³ S.M. Soloviev, *Исторія отношеніи*, pp. 46 ff.

⁵⁴ Dvornik, *The Slavs*, p. 213.

⁵⁵ Kern, p. 12.

⁵⁶ Kliuchevsky, *Курс*, 1: 95.

but on the contrary it introduced an alternate method of selection which complicated the nature of princely rulership and ultimately so weakened it as to make the princely seat at Kiev ineffectual in the administration and defense of the principality.

ПВА, as we have previously observed, has furnished considerable detail on the administrative achievements and military exploits of the princes during the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian cycle. These accomplishments are frequently couched in biblical similes and therefore it is difficult to establish what impact Scandinavian administrative and military practices had upon the Eastern Slavs with the advent of the Riurikid house in Kievan history. The *Ynglinga Saga* makes some reference to early Norse customs, which might provide a basis for comparison. In practice, the *drott* and *konungr* were responsible for the administration and defense of their lands, but as was practice the sovereign delegated his administrative responsibilities to an earl or a lesser noble, while retaining the military obligations for himself.⁵⁷ A general characteristic of Scandinavian rulership was the lack of proper national administrative and organizational ability. This weakness became more insubstantial with the Norse reluctance to place themselves under the aegis of a single sovereign and their belief that all freemen were the equals of the ruler. There was present then an absence of enthusiasm for territorial and administrative cohesiveness,⁵⁸ leading to frequent civil disturbances within a political community and warfare between nations.

In contrast to the Nordic sovereign rulers, the princes of Kievan Rus' from Vladimir to Jaroslav demonstrated a remarkably high sense of political order. This was not accomplished with ease. With the onset of Riurik's rule, he and his offspring sought to consolidate the Eastern Slavs and other tribes under their monolithic family rule. Each generation of princes had to demonstrate their worth at rulership, more frequently in tests of combat, and had to establish their claim to sovereignty and the right to collect tribute from the subject peoples.⁵⁹ Vladimir made the most notable advances in the

⁵⁷ Snorri Sturluson, pp. 6 ff.

⁵⁸ Cf. T.D. Kendrick, *A History of the Vikings* (New York, 1930), pp. 19–20 and 115; J. Brøndsted, *The Vikings* (Baltimore, 1965), pp. 224–225; and G. Jones, *A History of the Vikings* (New York-Toronto, 1968), p. 152.

⁵⁹ Older, but still useful sources on this topic are B. Senkovsky, *Собрание сочинений Сенковскаго (Барона Брамбеуса)*, 5 (St. Petersburg, 1853): 458–459; and M. Pogodin, *Норманский периодъ русской исторіи* (Moscow, 1859). Cf. the good summation of the Varangian question of the Normanist and Anti-Normanist schools within Russia and USSR with extensive notations, in V.A. Mosin, "Варяго-русский вопрос," *С 10* (1931): 109–136, 343–379, and 501–587

administration of the land, reforms which had been initiated by his grandmother and completed shortly after his conversion to Christianity. He finished the process of abolishing traditional tribal lands as a fundamental unit of administrative jurisdiction and replaced them with supra-tribal territorial administrations at whose head sat each of his twelve sons as *ПОСАДЬНИКИ* and who were responsible for the performance of executive duties and defense in their respective regions.⁶⁰ The compilers of *ПВЛ* view this achievement in biblical terms, although it is true that Vladimir's accomplishment is a major departure from traditional Scandinavian executive decentralism.

In Norse thought, rulers were necessary mainly for the administration and military defense of the land, the latter perhaps being their most demanding obligation. The *Ynglinga Saga* records that a *drott* or *konungr*, much like the Sanskrit *janaka*, was a petty ruler who was supreme in his own domain which included only those lands that he could defend and which he possessed by *odel* (*alod*) right,⁶¹ that is, allodial lands claimed in absolute independence, free of such encumbrances as rent, service, or the acknowledgement of a superior. By the mid-ninth century this practice underwent change and a custom developed in parts of Scandinavia to consolidate a number of *odels* and to designate a high king. A demand had arisen among the freemen for supra-territorial authority to protect commercial interests and to furnish common defense. The rule of Halvdan the Black is one of the more notable achievements in this direction. The royal powers of the high king were understood to excel over those of lesser *konungr*, not only in rank, but as well in the administration of justice and the practice of piety. Too, the ideal qualities of a Norse high king now also included the admirable traits of a wise lawmaker, a just man, and a great warrior.⁶²

The concept of a high king or its Rus' equivalent of *ВЕЛИКИЙ КНЯЗЬ* may not have been wholly alien to the Eastern Slavs, at least those in the northwest, but precious little evidence exists in the sources to attest to its widespread use in pre-Kievan Rus'. *ПВЛ* records an obscure tradition of a Dulebian-Volynian federation having existed perhaps in the seventh and eighth

[repr. in V.V. Fomin, *Варяго-русский вопрос в историографии* (Moscow, 2010), pp. 11–102]; S.V. Iushkov, “К вопросу о дофеодальном (‘Варварском’) государстве,” *ВИ* 7 (1946): 45–65; Paszkiewicz, *Making*, p. 243; and A.V. Riasanovsky, “The Varangian Question,” in *I Normanni e la loro espansione in Europa nell’alto medioevo. 24 aprile 1968* (Spoleto, 1969), pp. 171–204 and 553–569.

⁶⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121; and 2: 105. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–165.

⁶¹ Snorri Sturluson, p. 40.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 16 and 40. Cf. Lowmianski, p. 116.

centuries,⁶³ presupposing therefore that a high ruler sat as its head. The Nordic *Örvarodda Saga*⁶⁴—possibly an eighth-century oral account set down in writing some centuries later—offers some evidence for a solution to this issue. Apparently writing of pre-Kievan Rus', the *Saga* relates:⁶⁵

Garðdaríki et sva mikitland, at pat var pa' margra konung riki.

The empire of the Gardariki [the land of fortified towns] is stretched out so much, on that account occasionally royal authority is impeded by many kings.

This source does not deny the existence of a centralizing authority among some of the Eastern Slavs; on the contrary, it establishes its presence. In Scandinavian usage, royal authority was identified with the high king, not the lesser *konungr*. *ПѢД* further preserves the notion of high rulership among the Eastern Slavs and other tribes inhabiting northern Rus'. The explanation given in this source for the invitation of Riurik and his kin is the absence of law and the presence of discord among the tribes of northern Rus. Therefore, the Slavs, Mer, Ves', and Krivichi issued a call:⁶⁶

ПОНЦЕМЪ СОБѢ КНЯЗѢ· НЖЕ БЫ БОЛОДѢЛЪ НАМН' Н СУДНАЪ ПО ПРАВУ·

Let us seek a prince who would govern us and judge according to the law.

The non-extant *ЮАХИМОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ* (*Joachim Annal*), compiled by Joachim, the first Christian bishop of Novgorod, and extracts of which V.N. Tatishchev claims to have had in his possession and which he incorporated into his *История российской*, records a tradition of unitary rule existing in Novgorod and its environs for some decades prior to the establishment of the Riurikid house. The last of these pre-Riurik princes in the late 850s was Gostomyśl', a Slav,⁶⁷ who had expired leaving apparently no male heir. Joachim would have us believe that a broad political order under monolithic Slavic authority prevailed at Novgorod. He does not, however, use the

⁶³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 11–13; and, 2: 8–10. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 55–56; and *БЛДР* 1: 68–69.

⁶⁴ C.C. Rafn, ed., *Antiquités russes d'après les monuments historiques des Islandais et des anciens Scandinaves*, 1 (Copenhagen, 1850): 93–109.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

⁶⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 19; and 2: 14, reads: ... ПОНЦЕМЪ ГАМН Б СОБѢ КНЯЗѢ. НЖЕ БЫ БОЛОДѢЛЪ НАМН Н РАДНАЪ. ПО РАДУ ПО ПРАВУ, "let us seek a prince who will govern and engage us with order according to the law." Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 59; and *БЛДР* 1: 74.

⁶⁷ Tatishchev, 1: 89, 108–110, and 286. Cf. P. Krug, *Forschungen in der älteren Geschichte Russlands*, 1 (St. Petersburg, 1848): 111–127; M. Gorlin, "La chronique de Joachim," *RES* 19 (1939): 40–51; Demin, pp. 240–243; and S.N. Azbelev, "Гостомысл," in *Варяго-русский вопрос в историографии*, ed. V.V. Fomin (Moscow, 2010), pp. 598–618.

distinction of a high ruler. Gostomysl's official title is given variously as elder, governor, prince, or simply ruler.⁶⁸ No conclusion should be reached that a trustworthy literary tradition of high rulership existed in pre-Kievan Rus'.

A more frequent and general Rus' literary usage of the distinction *князь* is manifest commencing with the reign of Vladimir, hence more than a century after the inception of this custom in Scandinavia. Riurik is rarely identified as a prince in the Rus' annals and only then in those sources of later provenance, the majority of which appear in the Muscovite period. Further, we should notice that Igor is titled nothing other than *князь*, as are his son Svjatoslav, and his grandsons Jaropolk, Oleg, and Vladimir. The notions of high rulership and the attributes attendant to this rank arrive late in Kievan Rus'. Until the ascendancy of Vladimir, the scribes chiefly note the Riurikid princes as distinguished for their administrative and military achievements. These are the basic characteristics of a *konungr*. On the other hand, with the inception of Vladimir's rule, he and his son Jaroslav (Svjatopolk and Mstislav excepted), possess the characteristics of higher kings. While the concept of a high king becomes fixed in the reign of Jaroslav, for his pro-Nordic tendencies and the maintenance of intimate relations with the leading Norse royal houses,⁶⁹ Vladimir is recognized as early as 980 in Scandinavian sagas and is provided a royal distinction. The sagas read:⁷⁰

Erá því hversu Vladimarr *konungr* svei Væringja málagjöldum

Concerning this, as *konungr* Vladimir deceived the Varangians

Infrequently during the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian epoch the early Rus' annalists found need to preserve an essential Nordic image of Kievan rulership. We should bear in mind, however, that with the establishment of Christianity as the official state religion the Scandinavian influence with its stress upon pagan customs and practices markedly declined. To demonstrate this diminishing Norse tendency prior to and after 988, V.T. Pashuto carefully examined the frequency of appearance and use of Varangian names in *ПРД*. He concludes that there was a significant drop in their usage after the Rus' conversion.⁷¹ But this evidence should not be interpreted as a clear

⁶⁸ Tatishchev, 1: 108–110.

⁶⁹ Cross, "La tradition," pp. 133–135.

⁷⁰ Italics mine. Rydzevskaia, p. 218.

⁷¹ Pashuto, pp. 21 ff.

indication of a general Nordic cultural decline; on the contrary, this is mainly a demonstration that the new converts adopted Christian *praenomen* and discontinued the use of appellations that they deemed to be paganistic.

The brief notice inserted in *ПВЛ* on the occasion of Mstislav's death in 1036 preserves an essential Norse image of his rule at Chernigov, although we should caution that similar descriptions also appear in Byzantine chronicles. This source, *ПВЛ*, records:⁷²

БѢ ЖЕ МЪСТИСЛАВЪ ДѢБЕЛЪ ТѢЛОМЪ ЧЕРМЕНЪ ЛИЦЕ БѢЛЫМА ОЧИМА ХРАБОРЪ
НА РАТИ МЛѢВЪ ЛЮБѢШЕ ДРУЖИНУ ПО БЕЛКУ НМѢННА НЕ ЦАДАШЕ НИ ПИТЬЯ НИ
ѢДЕННА БРАДАШЕ

Mstislav was corpulent of body, red-faced, large-eyed, brave in war, [and] kind. [He was] a great lover of retainers. He spared [them] neither riches, nor drink, nor prohibited [them] food.

At first reading, this Varangian characterization appears to be a misstatement, contradicting the historiographic tradition, which the Rus' scribes sought to project based upon biblical accounts of the kingdom of Ephraim and its interaction with the Philistines.⁷³ Mstislav's alliance with the Kasogi and Pechenegs conforms in many particulars with the ancient narratives. We should then expect that Mstislav would be eulogized not as a Varangian or Slavic Rus' prince, but rather in general Near Eastern conventions, perhaps pagan, Islamic, or even Judaic. Yet, in the final reckoning, the Rus' annalists may have interpreted Mstislav's role mirrored in the likeness of a Nordic *konungr* who took his inheritance and did with it as he pleased, and exemplified in his actions the common Norse traits of glory, courage, bravery, daring, contempt for death, and attachment to his retainers.

There appear other contradictions in the annalistic portrayals of Rus' princes. First, *ПВЛ* places an inordinate amount of stress upon the increasing number of bandits in the mid-990s. Since Vladimir had already made provision for administrative jurisdiction within the Kievan state, assigning this function to his sons, the question of bandits should have been addressed as a local issue and not as a national matter. Should then the definition of *РАЗБОЙНИЦИ* be understood in conventional usage, or did the Rus' annalists seek to disguise the true nature of events, in part because they lacked historiographic conformity and because they brought embarrassment for the religious scribes? The early Rus' annals do not offer an adequate explana-

⁷² *ПСРЛ* 1: 150; and 2: 138. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 136; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–193.

⁷³ Cf. *IKings* xii, 1–xiv. 20; and *II Chronicles* x. 1–xii. 15.

tion. Turning to Scandinavian sources, the *Saga* of King Olaf Tryggvason⁷⁴ furnishes two clues. Olaf had spent much of his youth in the company and service of Vladimir from the early 970s to approximately 995, and was therefore familiar with Rus' problems, understanding the role of the Kievan prince in the unification, administration, protection, and Christianization of the principality. Olaf's *Saga* recalls that Thorwald Kodranson, having distinguished himself for his bravery and leadership as a member of the Byzantine Varangian guard,⁷⁵ was bestowed a special honor by Basil II and appointed *overseer* and ruler of all "Kings" and the undivided realm of *Garda* (the Norse equivalent for Kievan Rus').⁷⁶ It is plausible that Basil became displeased with his brother-in-law who remained aloof of the emperor and sought to dispossess Vladimir of his seat. But noticeably, Kodranson failed in his attempt to wrest power from Vladimir. The Rus' annalists must have interpreted his raid as a typical Viking incursion, although these scribes on ecclesiastical grounds must have construed Basil's actions with incredulity, hence their obvious silence on the matter.

As for the second clue, the *ПВА* reference to *разбонници* coincides with the death of King Hakon in Scandinavia. Some of his *konungr* took their share of the inheritance and set out to conquer new lands and to accumulate greater wealth. Their attacks, however, were largely confined to the Novgorod region and to the territories to the west.⁷⁷ The *Olaf Saga* does not attempt to show that their incursions extended southward toward Kiev. It is unlikely then that *ПВА* made specific reference to the northern raids, but on the contrary to the Byzantine Varangian incursion.

Svjatopolk's image in the Rus' annals generally corresponds to the biblical likeness of Cain, who slew his brother Abel, but with two exceptions. It has been demonstrated that Svjatopolk wrongfully arrogated his claim to exercise the powers of government and divine will ordained that he was not entitled to rule. Nevertheless, the Rus' scribes invoked the Nordic custom of the right of popular deposition of an unjust and sinful ruler. Through his deeds, Svjatopolk brought judgment upon himself, forfeiting his claim to the Kievan seat and proving his unfitness to be its prince. Redress for his transgressions was attained through the judgment of battle and his flight.

⁷⁴ Rafn 1: 393–477; Sephton; and Snorri Sturluson, pp. 118ff. Cf. de Baumgarten, *Olaf Tryggvason*.

⁷⁵ Sephton, pp. 187–188.

⁷⁶ Cf. Benedikz, pp. 20–24.

⁷⁷ Snorri Sturluson, p. 183.

At the same time, the Rus' annalists preserved the Scandinavian tradition that even though a king showed his unsuitability to rule, the Kievan prince retained his royal dignity of *князь*, which title was conferred upon him by virtue of his birth and was rightfully his for the remainder of his life.⁷⁸

The Rus' annalists were unusually sensitive to the solitary rule of Jaroslav. Not only was his sole rule contrary to the biblical historiographic tradition that had been established for the years from 980 to 1036, but specific acts—his rebellion against his father; his issuance of the *Русская Правда*; his dependence upon an inordinate number of Varangian retainers who were known for their baser qualities of ruthlessness, vengeance, hatred, and cunning; and his marriage to Ingegerd, the daughter of Olaf, king of Sweden, in 1019⁷⁹—cast him in a Nordic likeness and explains the *lacunae* that appear in *ПБЛ* for his early years. The Rus' scribes sought to disassociate him from his Nordic roots and stressed his love of books and the inculcation under his tutelage of Greek literature on a larger scale. But this was a momentary digression from his Scandinavian proclivities. Even upon his deathbed, Jaroslav is portrayed in a Nordic light. As well, he adopted a method of succession that was alien to the Eastern Slavs. It is not unexpected then that no copy or even a fragment of a eulogy survives memorializing his deeds upon his passing. While his achievements at rulership were noble, his Norse image cast a shadow upon them and we find an absence of elaboration upon his accomplishments.⁸⁰

Contemporaneous Nordic and Germanic accounts preserve their own respective characteristic significations of the nature and the image of Kievan princely rule. The *Olaf* and *Eymundar Sagas*⁸¹ give intimate pictorial descriptions of Vladimir's, Mstislav's, and Jaroslav's courts. Each of the depictions identifies the princes with the Scandinavian nomenclature of *konungr*, without any commentary upon the nature of the powers of Rus' rulers, or upon the differences in the exercise of their offices. The *Sagas* also fail to see any significant dissimilarity between the introduction of Byzantine Christianity in Kievan Rus' and the Latin ritual common to Scandinavia and the impact that these distinctive creeds had upon the nature of rulership. The Scandina-

⁷⁸ Kern, pp. 87–93 and 101–103.

⁷⁹ Snorri Sturluson, p. 302.

⁸⁰ Cf. Budovnits, pp. 41–42, who attempts to refute this contention.

⁸¹ Snorri Sturluson, *passim*; Rafn, 2 (Copenhagen, 1852): 173–211. Cf. F. Braun, "Das historische Russland im Nordischen Schrifttum des X.–XIV. Jahrhunderts," in *Festschrift Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag 19. Juli 1924* (Halle, 1924), pp. 150–196; and S.H. Cross, "Jaroslav the Wise in Norse Tradition," *Sp* 4 (1929): 177–197.

vian writers, though they had a deep respect for kingship, were conditioned by their own experiences and are most contradictory in their depictions of the Rus' princes.

A comparable problem exists in Germanic sources. Bruno of Querfurt, who visited Kiev in 1006, relates in his correspondence to the future German emperor Henry II a description of his journey and identifies Vladimir as *senior Ruzorum*, "Rus' sovereign," and *magnus regno*, "the great [one] within the kingdom."⁸² Bruno employs these same distinctions elsewhere in his writings to identify Henry II of Bavaria, Boleslas of Poland, and the kings of Sweden. Bishop Thietmar of Merseberg, a contemporary of Vladimir, recalls the conflict of the *rex Ruscorum* with the Poles.⁸³ Adam of Bremen records in his 1043 entry the marriage of Jaroslav's daughter, Elizabeth, to Harald of Norway. Adam distinguishes Jaroslav as the "saintly king."⁸⁴ The problem of linguistic traditionalism, so common in Byzantine sources, is equally applicable to Scandinavian and Germanic accounts. *Князь* was identified as an equal in his rank and authority with the Germanic image of *rex* and the Nordic *konungr*, although the latter terms were in the tenth and eleventh centuries undergoing substantial modification in their connotations. *Rex* and *konungr* were assuming some of the powers and distinctions associated with the Roman *caesar*. This was a further legacy of Latin Christianity and the theocratic concept became an aspect of Germanic and somewhat of Scandinavian rulership. But the Norse and German scribes remained steadfast in understanding Kievan princely rule from their respective viewpoints, and hence we have no commentaries upon the dissimilarities.

Unquestionably, the Nordic tradition of rulership in Kievan Rus' underwent modifications with the advent of Byzantine Christianity and with its primary stress upon the notion that a prince's powers derive from above, not from below. The Rus' scribes then sought a redefinition of the relationship of the ruler to the ruled. Their task was all the more eased because Varangian political thought was poorly established in Rus' and their merchant-warriors had little interest in establishing long-lived political institutions and practices. Rather, they pursued material and martial gains for immediate advantage, and, with the Slavic ascendancy beginning with Olga, their role in Rus'

⁸² Bruno of Querfurt, *PL* 144 (1882): cols. 977–979. Cf. M. Hellmann, "Vladimir der Heilige in der zeitgenössischen abendländischen Überlieferung," *JGO* 7 (1954): 403–405.

⁸³ Thietmar VII.70 f.

⁸⁴ Adam of Bremen, *PL* 146: col. 526 (II.36); *MGH, Scriptores* 7: 339; and the Tschan edition, p. 81.

society was mainly that of mercenaries as is evident during the reigns of Vladimir and Jaroslav. But the transition from one set of ideals to another was neither stark nor abrupt. Thus we encounter during the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian phase of Rus' history the retention of many basic Norse concepts and practices of rulership even though conditions then peculiar to Kievan Rus' were now having a far greater impact upon the formation and the nature of its society, its goals, and its ideals. The Christianized Rus' scribes sought not a Nordic explanation of events and the actions of its princes, except when it suited them as in the case of Mstislav, but mainly turned to biblical and Christian examples to justify their understanding of the nature and the image of Kievan rulers.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE KHAZARS IN THE SHADOWS OF KIEVAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

The Kievan Rus' had developed much more than a simple or perfunctory interest in the texts of the Old Testament. Their preoccupation with biblical writing, which became one of the foundations for the formulation of a Vladimirian-Jaroslavian historiographic tradition, stems not solely from their conversion to Christianity and their acquaintance with its literature. Earlier roots are to be recognized, even though the Rus' sources are muted on the subject. Unfortunately, *ПВЛ* and Rus' literature contemporaneous to this period of study provide us with fleeting references to the occurrence of a Turkic Khazar-Judaic tradition in Kievan Rus'. Arab, Judaic, and the few Khazar fragments fail to provide more details on this tradition or to elucidate upon this subject. The impact then of Khazar political thought upon Rus' notions of princely rulership is equally elusive and difficult to comprehend. Yet, at the same time, this contact has merited substantial scholarly attention.¹ We should, however, bear in mind from the onset of this examination that the zenith of the Khazar khaganate had expired and was anterior to our chronological period. The importance of the khaganate as a bulwark against Asian nomadic incursions and as a commercial center at the

¹ А.Е. Наркату, *Сказанія Мусульманскихъ писателей о Славянскихъ и Русскихъ*. (Съ половины VII вѣка до конца X вѣка по р. х.) (St. Petersburg, 1870; repr., The Hague-Paris, 1969); *idem*, *Дополненія къ сочиненію "Сказанія Мусульманскихъ писателей о Славянахъ и Русскихъ"* (St. Petersburg, 1871); J. Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig, 1903); Parkhomenko, "Киевская Русь и Хазария," pp. 380–387; M.I. Artamonov, *Очерки древнейшей истории Хазар* (Leningrad, 1936); A.A. Vasiliev, *The Goths in the Crimea* Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America 11 (Cambridge, 1936): 119 ff.; R. Grousset, *L'Empire des steppes* (Paris, 1939), pp. 133 ff.; В.А. Рыбаков, "Русь и Хазария (К исторической географии Хазарии)," in Академия Наук СССР. Институт Истории, *Академику Борису Дмитриевичу Грекову ко дню семидесятилетию. Сборник статей* (Moscow, 1952), pp. 76–88; D.H. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars* (Princeton, 1954); T. Lewicki, *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny*, 1 (Wrocław-Cracow, 1956); I. Boba, *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs: Eastern Europe in the Ninth Century* (The Hague-Wiesbaden, 1967), pp. 39–76; and for a broad treatment of Khazar-Rus' relations, cf. M.I. Artamonov, *История Хазар* (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 2002), pp. 368–387.

confluence of the Volga and Don Rivers, respectively with the Caspian and Azov Seas, was eclipsed by conquest, and a rapid decline soon set in after Svjatoslav had administered to this state a major military defeat.² The impact of Khazar notions of rulership upon the Rus' would somewhat take the form of a residual effect rather than a direct contemporaneous influence.

The Rus' annalists at no time, and without exception between 980 and 1054, express as equal in rank their *князьи* with the Khazar *khagan/qaqan* (the Persian form of this term is *kaghan*, while the Arabic is rendered as *khāqān*; and each of these terms derives from a common Sanskrit root—*rājān*—as does the Mongol *khan*). The Rus' annalists do not attempt to interpret the offices of *князь* and *khagan* as identical in power and sense of sovereignty. There exists, however, one major exception to this general statement. Hilarion, briefly the head of the Rus' church during the reign of Jaroslav, identified in his *Похвала Кагану Владимиру* Vladimir as *khagan*.³ The text of the *Похвала* reads in part as follows:⁴

Хвалит же и похвалными глагоу римьская страна Петра и Павла, нмже веро-
ваша в Инсѣа Христа Сына Божна, Ясна и Ффес, Патьма Юанна Боголова,
Индна Фомла, Египет Марка, вса страну и людне чтѣт и славит кое гождо
нхъ учитеаи, нже наѣчнша праволавнен вере. Похвалим же и мы, по силе
нашен, малыми похвалами беликаа и днбнаа сътворшаго, нашего учитеаи и
наставника, великаго кагана нашего земляа, Владимера, вѣдѣа стараго Игоря,
сына же славнаго Святослава, нже в свѣа лета владычествѣюща, мѣжѣтвом
же и хрѣбрьством прослѣша в странахъ многнхъ и помниающа ныне и словѣт ...
каган наш Владимер ... мѣжѣтвом же и смыслом предспѣа, и единодержѣщѣ
бывѣ земанъ своен....

The Roman land praises with a laudable voice Peter and Paul, through whom it believes in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Asia and Ephesos, and Patmos John the Divine, India Thomas, Egypt Mark. All lands, cities, and people do homage and glorify here and there their teacher, who taught them the Orthodox faith. Let us also praise according to our power with lesser eulogistics our teacher

² *ПСРЛ*: 65; and 2: 53. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 84; and *БЛДР*, 1: 114–115. For an extensive and critical treatment of Svjatoslav's attack upon the Khazars, cf. Vasiliev, *The Goths*, pp. 119–131.

³ Ponomarev, 1: 69–78. By contrast, the eulogy of the monk Jakob—*Память и похвала равноапостольному князю Владимиру* and the *Житие*, Makarii, *Исторія русской церкви*, 1: 255–263, and 264–268, do not contain this distinctive attribution. For a variant text, *Казанская духовная академия № 616*, that also lacks this Khazar distinction, cf. V.I. Sreznevsky, “Память и Похвала Кн. Владимиру,” pp. 2–4.

⁴ Italics mine. Ponomarev, 1: 69–70. Cf. N. Golb and O. Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century* (Ithaca and London, 1982); trans. into Russian by V.Ia. Petrukhina, *Хазарско-Еврейские документы X века* (Moscow, 1997), p. 89 and commentary p. 214; and Gumilev, pp. 283–284 and 371.

and preceptor who has accomplished great and wondrous things, the *great khagan* of our land, Vladimir, the grandson of ancient Igor, the son of glorious Svjatoslav, who in their time exercised sovereignty, are renown for their courage and valor in many lands and are mentioned now and celebrated ... our *khagan* Vladimir ... having succeeded with courage and with understanding. He was the sole possessor of his land

Hilarion further speaks of Jaroslav as a *khagan* who inherited his father's powers, who did not destroy Vladimir's institutions, but confirmed them, and who finished what his father had left unfinished.⁵ We could vindicate Hilarion for his substitutive usage of a royal distinction of Turkic provenance and not dismiss the phraseology as an example of literary embellishment, or perhaps license, if demonstrable historical evidence exists that the Kievan princely title was of the same degree of sovereignty and in other practical attributes of power as its Turkish counterpart.

A more exhaustive scrutiny of Near Eastern sources reveals the presence of imprecision in their rendering of a definition for *khagan*. The title only implies a sovereign and independent ruler. At an earlier stage in Khazar history, prior to the seventh century, this head of a state was viewed as a grand ruler—the equal of Sassanid kings and the emperors of China. But in the tenth century there existed in the khaganate a double kingship, which made their political organization difficult to interpret for the writers of the age, leading them to posit varying notions. Under normal circumstances, the *khagan*, the first king, was an agent of the divine aspects of rulership, hence a king-priest. The *beg*, the second king, had official authority to exercise command over the military forces and also the power to administer the executive functions of the khaganate within the sphere of his official duties. Nevertheless, this orderly dichotomization of authority did not always prevail and numerous Khazar, Judaic, and Arabic accounts furnish contravening commentaries to complicate our comprehension of the nature of this dual kingship.

Khazar references to the framework of their rulership are few and tendentious. A court legend, attributed to the pen of Muhammad ibn-'Ali al-Kātib al-Samarqandi, a twelfth-century writer, and preserved in a Persian text, belongs to the literary genre known as the "Mirror of Princes." His style is turgid, but his meaning is comprehensible and a portion of the text reads:⁶

⁵ Ponomarev, 1: 76.

⁶ I have employed the translation of this complex text rendered by Dunlop, p. 16, who was assisted of V. Minorsky.

Khaqan, king of the Khazars [was] that sovereign, the eagle of whose majesty had hunted down the *simurgh* of happiness, and the falcon of whose kingdom-adorning, state-nurturing wisdom had made a prey of the peacock that was the high rank of world-dominion.

S. Schechter, who has furnished an English translation and an analysis of a Khazar's commentary on the conversion of his people to Judaism and other aspects of their history, likens the title of *grand khagan* with the position occupied by the Mikado:⁷

... leading a strictly secluded life, and never coming into direct contact with his subjects.

Schechter adds that the *peg* or *peh* (italics are mine) had the status of a vice-*khagan* or vice-king, but retained for himself all military and administrative duties and, therefore, was the real power in the khaganate.⁸ We should not readily accept Schechter's interpretation without some skepticism. Other sources do not confirm that the lesser of two kings, the *peg*, assumed or was delegated to assume the sovereign office and duties of the *khagan*. A further corruption upon the nature of this dual kingship is given in the five-volume *Sepher ha-Kūzari* (*The Book of Khazars*), a philosophical dialogue and a defense of Rabbinic Judaism by Jehudah ha-Levi, an early twelfth-century Hebrew poet-physician, who views the *khagan* as a king who sits side by side, apparently as an equal, with the *beg* whose chief function is cited as that of a military general.⁹ While we might dismiss the contention of their equality as unlikely, the Hebrew correspondence exchanged between the Khazar king Joseph and Hasdai Ibn-Shaprūt of Spain confirms the military functions of the *beg*.¹⁰

Arabic sources, which both confirm and dispute our discussion thus far, remain a major avenue for an understanding of the nature of Khazar double kingship. At the turn of the tenth century, that is, in 903, the Arab geographer Mohammad Ibn-Rusta states in his encyclopedic work:¹¹

⁷ Schechter, p. 189. Further, on the *Letter of an Anonymous Khazar Jew* or "Schechter Letter," cf. *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium Hosted by the Ben Zvi Institute*, eds. P.B. Golden, H. Ben-Shammai, and A. Róna-Tas, *Handbook of Oriental Studies* 17 (Leiden and Boston, 2007): 40 and 145–146.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Dunlop, pp. 116 ff.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 125 ff. The text of this correspondence appears in P.K. Kokovtsov, *Еврейско-хазарская переписка в X веке* (Leningrad, 1932), pp. 72–89 and 113–123.

¹¹ *BGA*, ed. M.J. Goeje, 7 (Leiden, 1894): 139–140. The above translation is taken from

They have a king who is called Īsha. The supreme king is Khazar Khaqan. He does not enjoy the obedience of the Khazars but has the name only. The power to command belongs to the Īsha, since in regard to control and the armies he is so placed that he does not have to care for anyone above him.

Some two decades later, an Arab traveler, Ahmad Ibn-Fadlān notes:¹²

As to the king of the Khazars whose name is Khāqān, he only appears every four months for recreation. He is called the Great Khaqan. His lieutenant is called Khāqān B-h. It is he who leads the armies and gives them their orders. He controls and manages state affairs, appears in public and goes on military expeditions. The neighboring kings obey him. He goes humbly in every day to the superior Khaqan, displaying deference and modesty When he has greeted him ... he sits with the king on his throne at his right hand.

And further he relates:¹³

The custom of the superior king is that he does not give audience to the people and does not speak with them, and no one enters his presence except those we have mentioned. Power to loose and to bind, punishments and the rule of the kingdom belong to his lieutenant, the Khaqan B-h [*sic*].

Also, Ibn-Fadlān states:¹⁴

The length of their rule is forty years. If the king exceeds it by a single day, the subjects and his courtiers kill him, saying, His reason has failed and his understanding has become disordered.

Saxo Grammaticus, a Danish historian and poet who flourished about 1200, writes that among the Slavs "... by statute of the ancients, the succession was appointed to the slayers of the kings."¹⁵ The prevalence of this practice among the Slavs is doubtful, although some obscure Slavic tribes may have had a custom similar to the Khazars. Too, they could well have borrowed

Dunlop, p. 104. In his work, *Zayn al-Akhbar*, ed. V.V. Bartold [Barthold], ЗИАН, series 8/1/4 (1897): 95 ff., Gardīzī, a Persian writer of the next century, appears to draw heavily upon Ibn-Rusta. Gardīzī designates the lesser king *Abshād*; and in the early twelfth century, the Persian writer Marvazī, reiterates in his *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhīr Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*, trans. and ed. V. Minorsky (London, 1942), Gardīzī's nomenclature.

¹² Dunlop, p. 111. Cf. A.P. Kovalevsky, *Книга Ахмеда Ибн-Фадлана о его путешествии на Волгу в 921–922 гг.* (Kharkov, 1956), pp. 135 ff. Note also the earlier but still useful edition of I.Iu. Krachkovsky, *Путешествие Ибн-Фадлана на Волгу: Перевод и комментарий* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1939).

¹³ Dunlop, p. 111.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

¹⁵ Saxo Grammaticus, *The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus ...*, trans. O. Elton, Publication of the Folklore Society 33 (London, 1894), p. 334.

such a practice from the khaganate, but we should not make too much of Saxo's statement. He may have had knowledge of remote Slavic peoples who lived on the periphery of the Danes, among whom this practice was common, but this is an isolated example and was not a widespread repeated practice among all Slavs.

Ibrahim al-Istakhri, a mid-tenth century Arab traveler and geographer whose principal work was *Masālik ul-Mamālik* (*Travels and Kingdoms*), sheds some additional light on the issue of Khazar rulership. He first relates that in the Khazar tongue their king is called *bak*, or also *bāk*, each term being the equivalent of *beg*. The king exercises by virtue of his office no claim upon the possessions and property of his subjects. But al-Istakhri establishes that the *khaqan* of the Khazars is greater in his standing than the *bak*, yet with the further qualification that it is the *bak* who nominates the *khaqan*.¹⁶ Ibn-Hauqal, a contemporaneous Arab geographer who is chiefly noted for his revision and extension of the *Masālik ul-Mamālik*, disputes al-Istakhri, reversing the appointive process and having the *khaqan* install the *bak*.¹⁷ In their own times, each of these writers may well have associated the peculiar political circumstances of the succession question to be commonplace and assumed this to be general practice for selecting either the *khaqan* or the *bak*. It would appear, on the contrary, that the *khaqan*, as a sovereign ruler with hereditary rights to the throne,¹⁸ should retain the privilege to designate a lesser king—the *bak*, whose office was not construed to be hereditary, but was appointive.¹⁹ However, this does not appear to have been the common custom.

Much of the essential evidence on Khazar kingship, which we have thus far examined in Arabic sources, is reaffirmed by a tenth-century Arab historian, Abū-l Hasan Mas'ūdī, in his chronological sketch, the *Murūj udh-Dhahab wa Ma'ādin ul-Jawāhir* (*Meadows of Gold and Mines of Precious Stones*), which he completed in 947. Mas'ūdī reflects:²⁰

... in Khazaria there is a Khaqan whose custom it is to be in the power of another king and in his house. The Khaqan is in the interior of a castle, able neither to ride forth nor to appear to the nobles or commons, nor to go out from his lodging, where he is with his women, neither ordering nor

¹⁶ *BGA* 1 (Leiden, 1870): 220–226.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 2 (Leiden, 1873): *passim*.

¹⁸ Dunlop, p. 145; and Schechter, pp. 200–201.

¹⁹ Dunlop, p. 145.

²⁰ Mas'ūdī, *Les Prairies d'Or*, trans. and eds. C. Barbier de Meynard and P. de Courteille, 2 (Paris, 1863): 12–14.

forbidding, nor managing affairs of state. Yet the sovereignty of the Khazars is not secured to their king save by the Khaqan being with him in the capital and in his castle. When Khazaria suffers from dearth or any calamity befalls their country or war with some other nation or any emergency, the commons and the nobles hasten to the king of the Khazars, saying, 'We have drawn a bad omen from the Khaqan and his reign, and have augured ill of him, so kill him, or hand [him] over to us to kill.' Sometimes he hands him over to them, and they kill him. Sometimes he undertakes this himself. But sometimes he shows him mercy and protects him, as guilty of no crime or sin. This is the custom of the Khazars at present The dignity of this Khaqan belongs to a family among their chief men, in whom I suppose the kingship originally resided, but God knows best.

In consonance with Khazar political thought, sovereign authority then was the exclusive domain of the *khagan*. However, this proved to be a rather empty manifestation of respect. His office was chiefly symbolic and he was honored as a king-priest in accordance with oriental tradition. The *khagan*, on the other hand, had no means to enforce his will or to act upon matters of state. All administrative and military functions were conferred upon the *bak*, and notwithstanding his vast authority he judiciously demonstrated his deference for the *khagan*, his sovereign.

Examples of dual kingship in Kievan history are most difficult to distinguish, nor is the impact of such a notion easily discernible. The Khazars did exercise political dominion over some Eastern Slavic tribes after the seventh century and one would expect that the latter did acquire some knowledge of this political legacy, although this does not of necessity imply that they practiced this Khazar notion of dual rulership. The chief benefit that the Khazars brought to these Slavs of the western steppe and the forest zone to the north was the introduction of political stability, imposed and maintained by the *bak*. Khazar concerns for these regions stemmed from commercial interests and secondarily from political domination. These Slavs appear to have accepted their circumstances, and in 859 *ПБЛ* records for that year that the Poljane, Sever, and Vjatichi were required to pay tribute to the Khazars.²¹ Svjatoslav terminated this practice with his conquest of Khazaria.

The maintenance of a peaceful order imposed by the Khazars proved advantageous to the Eastern Slavs who came under their preponderant influence. In the centuries preceding the arrival of the Norse, the Slavs had entered a transitional phase in the evolution of their social and political

²¹ *ПСП* 1: 19; and 2: 15. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 59; and *БЛДП* 1: 74–75.

institutions. This transformation coincides with the appearance of fortified trading centers, *градъ*, the singular of which is *градъ*, and their subsequent development into towns and larger urban centers.²² The Near Eastern scholar J. Brutzkus attributes the rise of Kiev (כּוֹבֵב [= כּוֹבֵב] *Qiyōb*²³) to Khazar initiatives in this period.²⁴ His argumentation is based upon philological evidence and merits historical attention. But nowhere in this transitional phase do we find firm evidence of the implantation of the concept of dual kingship.

In our main period of study, two sources—the *Heimskringla* and *ПѢД*—furnish some evidence that the Khazar notion of dual rulership had a modicum of influence among the Rus'. Snorri Sturluson relates that Olaf Trygvason in the 970's served Vladimir, then prince of Novgorod, as his head of the army, which guarded the land.²⁵ Snorri appears to imply, although distortion is probable in his work, that Vladimir delegated this function to Olaf. It appears unlikely that Vladimir would contravene Scandinavian and Rus' customs. The primary responsibility for the defense of land fell respectively upon the *konungr* and the *кнѧзь*. We should not dismiss the possibility that as prince of Novgorod and the prince of Kiev, Vladimir, given his youth while in the north, had some inclination to experiment with the formation of his political and social institutions, modifying them upon the recommendations of his advisors to meet the particular needs of his reign. Later, the appointment of his sons as *поладьники*, the mingling of Slavic and Norse pagan deities, and the consideration and eventual adoption of Christianity as the official state religion clearly demonstrate his proclivity to be innovative, even at the expense of contravening established customs and traditions that were numerous. It is plausible then that Vladimir, having some knowledge of Khazar dual kingship, applied an aspect of this concept and appointed Olaf to be chief of the land army. But when Olaf became too powerful and fell into disfavor with the prince's wife (her name is not furnished in the sources, but it may have been Rogned), the Norseman left Kievan Rus'.²⁶

²² Note the extensive treatment given to this topic by Tikhomirov in his *Древнерусские города*.

²³ Golb, and Pritsak, p. 20 f.

²⁴ J.D. Brutzkus, "The Khazar Origin of Ancient Kiev," *SEER* 22 (1944): 108–124. Cf. Shaikin, pp. 50–53; and A.A. Tortika, "Киевское письмо' хазарских евреев: К проблем критики содержания источника," *Материалы по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии* 10 (2002): 535–542.

²⁵ Snorri Sturluson, pp. 118–119 and 129.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 129–130.

The reign of Mstislav after 1019 is most imprecisely described by the Rus' annalists and proves to be inexplicable for students of *ПБЛ*. Conforming on the one hand to an Old Testament historiographic tradition and to Jeroboam's kingdom of Ephraim, which was noted for its racial interbreeding and religious corruption, Mstislav is portrayed in biblical similitude, yet at the same time his brief eulogy characterizes him with conventional Scandinavian praises. But the nature of his rulership is never clearly established. When he and Jaroslav formally divided the Kievan principality along the course of the Dnieper River, the younger brother proposed that the elder should take the seat of Kiev, the mother of Rus' urban centers. Mstislav appears also to have relinquished any claim to sovereign power, which he may have believed rightfully belonged to Jaroslav as the eldest. The Rus' annalists appear then to have interpreted Mstislav's function primarily as military. *ПБЛ* records his attack upon the Kasogi in 1022;²⁷ with the aid of his current allies, the Khazars and Kasogi, his march against Jaroslav the following year;²⁸ and in the early 1030's his combined assault with Jaroslav upon the Poles.²⁹ The absence of any discussion of Mstislav's sovereign powers and of his role as a lawmaker, protector of the church, and other princely functions, leads to the suspicion that the Rus' scribes may have viewed him in the guise of a Khazar *bak*, but without a formal conferment of this rank upon him.³⁰

Modern scholars are not of one mind in their interpretations of the dual rule of Jaroslav and Mstislav and its effect upon their lawmaking authority. S.M. Soloviev maintains that the territorial divisions of 1026 left parts of Kievan Rus' without any law.³¹ He fails to mention that these regions may have reverted to traditional customary laws with which they were familiar. Tatishchev argues that aside from the creation of the dual principalities and the division of power, this was an informal arrangement and unitary rule prevailed.³² He believes, therefore, that Jaroslav remained the sovereign with full juridical powers over all Kievan Rus' and Mstislav occupied an inferior place, thus explaining why only rarely is he designated with any noble designation in the sources.

²⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 146; and 2: 134. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 134; and *БЛДР* 1: 188–189.

²⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 147; and 2: 134. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 134; and *БЛДР* 1: 190–191.

²⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 150; and 2: 137. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 136; and *БЛДР* 1: 192–193.

³⁰ Cf. Parkhomenko, "Киевская Русь и Хазария," pp. 381–384, who stresses a semi-legendary element in their relationship.

³¹ S.M. Soloviev, *История отношения*, pp. 66–67.

³² Tatishchev, 1: 351.

The Khazars did not believe that the lawmaking authority was an essential attribute of either the *khagan's* or the *bak's* powers. The khaganate, a loose empire inhabited by diverse ethnic and religious groups who over the course of time developed varying legal standards that satisfied their needs, required only a semblance of juridical uniformity and accepted legal diversity among its subjects. The process of legal dissimilation may have worked to the detriment of Khazar law. Ibrahim ibn Jakub records that the Khazars used the Slavonic term *ЗАКОНЪ* (law) in daily court usage and the Slavs were tried according to their own customary law.³³ This usage is also noted by Constantine Porphyrogenetos.³⁴ The question of the lawmaking authority is further complicated by the Khazar ruling aristocracy's and military's acceptance of conversion to Judaism ca. 730. This was achieved without any obligation upon their subjects. The letter of Hasdai implies that Khazar Judaism was imperfectly developed and its teachings were not firmly entrenched within the khaganate.³⁵ Dunlop concludes that Turkic law and not Rabbinic law prevailed.³⁶ Had Hebrew stress upon normative law commanded a greater audience among the Khazars, both the elite and commoners, a more appreciable influence upon the Rus' would have been noticed. The absence of such emphasis explains why the Eastern Slavs first turned to the Northmen and later to the Byzantines to address this need for juridical uniformity. Schechter, however, drawing upon his study of a Khazar text, concludes that the *khagan*, following conversion, retained for himself the lawmaking authority. Several passages of this text read:³⁷

And the men of the land appointed over them one of the wise men as judge. And they call his name in the tongue of Khazaria, Khagan Therefore, the judges who arose after him are called by the name Khagan ... even unto this day.

This assertion should not be accepted at face value, but should be understood as semi-legendary in content and prone to exaggeration. The notion that *khagan* evolved from judges is refuted by the tenth-century Persian

³³ Ibrahim ibn Jakub (Ben Yakub), *Relacja Ibrāhūma ibn Ja'kūba z podróży do krajów słowiańskich w przekazie al-Bekriego*, ed. T. Kowalski, *MPH*, new series, 1 (Cracow, 1946): 52.

³⁴ Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Administrando Imperio*, DOT 1: 170–175.

³⁵ Kokovtsov, pp. 113 ff.

³⁶ Dunlop, pp. 92 and 217.

³⁷ Schechter, pp. 215–216.

geographer, Hudud al-Alam,³⁸ and Ibn-Rusta.³⁹ They relate that judicial authority belonged to a college of doctors, that is, judges, and this practice has some similarities to ancient Hebrew juridical customs. Vernadsky adds further that not only were the *khagans* denied the power of judgment, but that this privilege was also refused to the *baks*.⁴⁰ Hence, judgment was exclusive and beyond their competence.

The religious standards of the khaganate after their conversion to Judaism show no appreciable influence upon their Eastern Slavic subjects. Vladimir, who had contemplated adoption of the Hebrew faith through the Khazars, ultimately dismissed this prospect. From the context of *ПБЛ* we are led to believe that the Khazars, having learned of other religious missions to Vladimir's court, took it upon themselves to present their religious thoughts to the prince of Kiev. Though obviously a superficial argument, Vladimir gave little credence to their religious beliefs and practices because the Romans had dispersed the Jews in the first century AD⁴¹ Vladimir appears to imply that the Jews can make no claims of having a great extant empire—the equal of Byzantium, the Germans, or the Volga Bulgars. Nevertheless, Dvornik believes that Judaic ideas introduced by Jewish Khazar merchants residing in Kiev took hold and exerted a measurable influence upon Kievan Rus'.⁴² This could be an explanation for the need of at least hurried references to Khazar Judaism in the *ПБЛ* and later Rus' annals without simply dismissing the entire subject. Too, this could be a partial explanation for substantial Rus' familiarity with Old Testament texts and for the formulation of an independent Kievan historiographic tradition based upon biblical passages.

But Hilarion's *khagan* image of Vladimir's and Jaroslav's reigns appears to have some apparent causal connection to a definition of the nature of Kievan princely rulership. Scholars, however, have offered a number of diverse opinions relative to this relationship.⁴³ First, we should notice that this Turkic distinction was not generally used among the Eastern Slavs and Northmen. Only isolated individuals of whom we have little knowledge

³⁸ Hudud al-Alam, *The Regions of the World, A Persian Geography 372 A.H.—982 A.D.*, trans. V. Minorsky (London, 1937), p. 159.

³⁹ Ibn-Rusta, *passim*.

⁴⁰ G. Vernadsky, *The Origins of Russia* (Oxford, 1959), p. 191.

⁴¹ Cf. *ПСПЛ* 1: 85–86; and 2: 72–73. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 97; and *БЛДР* 1: 133–134.

⁴² Dvornik, *The Slavs*, p. 205. Cf. W. Philipp, *Ansätze zum geschichtlichen und politischen Denken im Kiewer Russland*, *JGO*, supplement 3 (Breslau, 1940): 6–24.

⁴³ For a comprehensive historiographic discussion of current opinion regarding the *khagan* question, cf. Shusharin, pp. 159–163.

from the sources make reference to this distinction. Only once was *khagan* employed in the early Rus' sources to demonstrate its terminological interchangeability and equality in rank with *кнѧзь*. *ПѢД* relates for the year 965:⁴⁴

ИДЕ СТОЛАВЪ НА КОЗАРЫ· СЛЫШАВШЕ ЖЕ КОЗАРИ· ИЗНАША ПРОТНУ· СЪ
КНАЗЕМЪ СВОИМЪ КАГАНОМЪ·

Svjatoslav proceeded against the Khazars. When the Khazars heard [this], they went out against him with their prince, the Khagan.

A graffito, appearing upon a wall in the Church of Saint Sophia in Kiev whose construction was initiated by Jaroslav the Wise, bears the inscription *СЪПАИИ Г[ОСПОД]И КАГ[А]НА НАШЕГО*, "Lord save our Khagan."⁴⁵ S.A. Vysotsky fixes the date of this inscription to the reign of prince Svjatoslav Jaroslavich who ruled Kiev from 1073 to 1076.⁴⁶ Shusharin associates its origin with the metropolitan Hilarion.⁴⁷ This fragmentary evidence regarding the Kievan usage of *khagan* has prompted modern scholars to arrive at a number of conclusions. Kliuchevsky believes that Hilarion borrowed the title *khagan* for Vladimir and Jaroslav to demonstrate that the Kievan *кнѧзь* was equal in authority with the Khazar suzerain.⁴⁸ Priselkov holds that Hilarion's *ПОУЧАЛИ* was composed in an allegorical style with no implied meaning in use of *khagan*.⁴⁹ Vernadsky, nevertheless, maintains that the Rus' concept of Kievan princely sovereign authority has its genesis partly as a consequence of Khazar dominion over early Kiev.⁵⁰ We should rather understand Hilarion's use of *khagan* in another context. Jaroslav and his contemporaries may have had a real rather than an imagined fear that the Byzantine emperor was attempting to assert his sovereignty over the Kievan principality. Hilarion then reflects this apprehension in his *ПОУЧАЛИ*. He sought, therefore, to establish that both Vladimir and Jaroslav were independent and sovereign rulers in the same political sense as the Khazar *khagan*. Hilarion, however, did not disclaim the religious affiliations, which existed between Kiev and Constantinople, and appears to have been willing to continue this ecclesiastical arrangement.

⁴⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 65; and 2: 53. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 84; and *БЛДР* 1: 114–115.

⁴⁵ S.A. Vysotsky, *Древнерусские надписи Софии Киевской XI-XIV вв.*, 1 (Kiev, 1966): 49.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁴⁷ Shusharin, p. 161. Cf. Laehr, pp. 122–123, who accepts the notion that the title *khagan* appeared in southern Rus' through the combined military and commercial interests of Byzantium and Khazaria in the region.

⁴⁸ Kliuchevsky, *Курс*, 1: 86. Contrast his contention with the religious interpretation rendered by Val'denberg, pp. 95–96.

⁴⁹ Priselkov, *Очерки*, p. 100 f.

⁵⁰ Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, p. 174.

Near Eastern sources are an important font of information for an understanding of the political evolution of Kievan rulership from its primitive beginnings to the mid-eleventh century. Though we are not concerned with the pre-Vladimirian era, it is essential to note the embryonic development of Kievan princely rulership according to these accounts and with what degree of accuracy they report the Rus' excellence, thus fixing an image of Kievan princely authority. Al-Istakhri records: "The king ... lives in a city called *Kuyābah* [Kiev]"⁵¹ And later in his account, he proceeds to furnish a customary Varangian depiction of Kievan rulers. The toponym *Kuyābah* appears to be a contraction of two separate terms—*Kuyā* being the Khazar substitute for Kiev and *bah* being a corruption of *bak*. Al-Istakhri must have been familiar with the tales recounting the origins of Kiev and the circumstances leading to its foundation. Kiev then was a military outpost under the nominal authority of the Khazar *bak*. We should not dismiss the probability that even in his time al-Istakhri, though aware that elements of the Varangian Rus' occupied the fortified town, comprehended the reigns of Oleg, Igor, and Olga as distinguished for their military prowess and achievements. Hence, he continued the use of the toponym *Kuyābah*, even after the term had lost its applicability. His contemporaries, Ibn-Rusta, drawing upon mid-ninth-century sources, and al-Alam respectively speak of a Rus' king designated *khaqan* and *khagan*. In the next century Gardīzi cites the *khaqan* of the Rus'.⁵²

Near Eastern sources, though fragmentary and somewhat early for the purpose of this study, do demonstrate a uniform belief and willingness to admit the independence and sovereign rule of the Kievan princes, and these same accounts list no impediments placed upon their powers. Nor do these same narratives seek to establish the dependence of the Kievan princes upon a Khazar *khagan*. Hilarion sought to preserve this Near Eastern theme and to extol in his *Πορχαλα* the notion that Kievan princely sovereignty was exclusive in its authority, was free of other rulers and their secular dictates, and enjoyed parity with the potentates of Khazaria and other Asiatic states, but his attempts at historiographic revisionism do not admit significant Khazar influences upon the definition of the nature and the image of Kievan princely power. If nothing more, Hilarion may have simply repeated an

⁵¹ *BGA* 1: 220 ff. Contrast his description of Varangian political society with the earlier work of Ibn Khordādhbeh, *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*, *BGA* 6 (Leiden, 1889): ch. XV ff.

⁵² Cf. *Hudud al-Alam*, p. 159.

analogy that Vladimir had addressed for himself, that is, he, as the Khazar *khagan*, was a prince who ruled an ethnically and religiously diverse people, much as the rule of his contemporary. A similar attribution cannot be assigned to Jaroslav and none of the annals or other sources so state.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE EASTERN SLAVIC POLITICAL AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The onset of Vladimir's rule initiated a more complex and generally a less recognizable role for three ancient Eastern Slavic institutions—the *князи*, *бояроды* (the military aristocratic commanders), and the *вече* (the urban popular assembly)—in Kievan princely affairs.¹ Heretofore, as we have observed, Rus' annalists and scribes had concerned themselves with theoretical speculations upon the nature and the image of Kievan princely power. But in describing the nature and developing an image of Kievan princely rulership, Rus' apologists could not exclude the native *князи*, *бояроды*, and *вече* from such considerations and may have sought to explain the displacement of the local *князи* and *бояроды* through the appearance of a hereditary Scandinavian aristocracy and the diminution in the influence of the *вече* through the rise of a monolithic, autocratic, and seemingly powerful national Riurikid ruling house. Against this background, we should notice the significant observation of Jonathan Shepard: "The 'land of Rus' was an archipelago of largely self-regulating communities. Extensive groupings in the north were still considered tribes"² A reinvestigation of the role of these institutions in the formative period of political and religious changes under Vladimir and Jaroslav merits attention, and of how these institutions impacted upon the evolution of the nature and the image of the Kievan princes or diminished the effectiveness of their rule.

The *князи*, descendants of tribal and clan leaders, have their roots in antiquity. These princes became in the seventh and eighth centuries the

¹ Vilkul, Tat'iana L., *Люди и князь в дренерусских летописях середины XI-XIII вв.* (Moscow, 2009), pp. 19 ff., and esp. for *вече*, pp. 21–37 and 226–324; and for *князи*, pp. 118 ff. Her concern is the study of "social" classes and not the "politico-military" institutions. For an analysis of the varied usage, imprecise definitions, and applications in the annals of the term *вече*, cf. Granberg, *passim*; and E.L. Keenan, "Вече," *Russian History/Histoire russe* 34 (2007): 83–99.

² Shepard, "The Origins of Rus;" p. 70; and S. Plokhy, *The Origins of Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus* (Cambridge, 2006), esp. pp. 10–41.

nucleus of a hereditary class of territorial nobles who held their domains as personal property. And too, these centuries are a most important transitional period in the evolution of Eastern Slavic political and social concepts. A major advance to shape their ideological outlook was the rise of trading centers (*ГРАДЫ*) and the growth of these outposts into towns and larger urban units. The *КНАЗЬИ*, as population concentrated at specific centers, began to abandon patriarchal rule over a given tribe or clan, and assumed the role of leadership over particular geographic regions, which had at their core trading towns of varying size and commercial significance.³ Tribal life, however, continued to predominate over much of the Rus' lands and the term *КНАЗЬ*, though known among the Eastern Slavs, is sparingly used and does not appear to have been widely adopted. There is little evidence then that the Eastern Slavs had developed an extensive national and native hereditary ruling house.

Vladimir's powers were never seriously challenged by local *КНАЗЬИ* claims to shared authority in the governance of the Kievan principality. The explanation for this development is historical in nature. First, the Riurikid princes, if in fact the usage of the term is valid and not adopted by the Northmen or invented by the Rus' scribes given the limited political and social advancement of the Varangians in that age who preceded Vladimir, did not suppress local initiatives. The Slavic *ГРАДЫ* and tribal centers could retain traditional social-political institutions so long as they remained in consonance with Riurikid interests. But frequent acts of rebellion forced Oleg and his successors to put down the insubordinate Slavs and to introduce the practice of appointing lesser Varangian aristocrats and *БОАРИ* to newly created administrative-defensive centers. The consequence of this practice was to enhance the commercial-martial interests of the Riurikid house and to hasten the process of subordinating the political and commercial practices of the local *КНАЗЬИ* to the authority of the Kievan prince.⁴

Then, too, after the eighth century a symbiosis of Scandinavian and Slavic aristocratic families and even intermarriage took place. Scandinavian

³ D'iakonov, *Очерки*, pp. 146–148; and P.N. Tret'iakov, *Восточнославянские племена* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1948), p. 167. Cf. F. Nowak, *Medieval Slavdom and the Rise of Russia*, The Berkshire Studies in European History (New York, 1930), pp. 38–48; and Marija Gimbutas, *The Slavs* (New York and Washington, 1971), pp. 133 ff. Note also the role of trade in the rise of towns in V.A. Parkhomenko, *У истоков русской государственности (VIII-XI вв.)* (Leningrad, 1924), pp. 28 ff.

⁴ Cf. *supra*, pp. 16–17.

merchant-warriors remained as permanent settlers in various *ГРАДЫ* and the *ЮАКИМОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ* elaborates upon their marriages into leading Slavic families, one of the more notable being the union between Igor and Olga.⁵ Common commercial interests facilitated the infusion of foreigners into Slavic aristocratic ranks and by the reign of Vladimir it is difficult to distinguish between a pure Slavic or a Nordic noble family. Clear evidence of national intermingling is the adoption of Slavonic appellations by Olga, examples of which are her son Svjatoslav and her grandsons, Jaropolk and Vladimir. And too, Vladimir's creation of a public pagan site for their respective deities to be worshipped alike by Slavs and Northmen is further proof of the commonality that had been achieved in larger population centers.⁶

The institution of the *ВОЕВОДЫ* predates the advent of the Northmen and appears to be a product of early Slavic tribal needs for self-defense and an outgrowth of tribal aristocracies. The rise of fortified enclosures paralleled the Khazar expansion into the western Pontic steppe. As they extended their nominal suzerainty over southern Rus', they must have fostered the evolution of the *ВОЕВОДЫ* and adapted them to the *bak's* military system. Some additional details about the nature of early Slavic military aristocracies are preserved in Constantine Porphyrogenetos's *De Administrando Imperio*. Though his account of the genealogy of the Turkic nation addresses Magyar antiquities, we should accept the conclusions of C.A. Macartney and Gy. Moravcsik that the first part of the passage is a separate account and Slavonic in derivation, and establishes that Constantine's ascription of the term *ὁ βοέβωδος* (*ВОЕВОДА*, *voevoda*) and later in the text *τὸ ζάκανον* (*zakon*, that is custom or law),⁷ are examples of common locution.⁸ The Magyars, settled in the vicinity of the lower Don-Volga river systems and briefly the Dnieper basins, were neighbors of both the Eastern Slavs and Khazars throughout much of the ninth century, hence furnishing some explanation for mutual linguistic interchangeability. Constantine records that the Magyar and therefore the Slavic ruler was designated *ὁ πρῶτος βοέβωδος ... τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀξίας*, "the first

⁵ Tatishchev, 1: 111, 116–117, 341, and 372.

⁶ Cf. *supra*, pp. 22–23.

⁷ Constantine Porphyronnetos, *De Administrando Imperio*, 1: 170–173.

⁸ C.A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, 1930; repr. 1968), pp. 98–101; and *Commentary to Constantine Porphyrogenetos, De Administrando Imperio*, 2: 145–149. Cf. G.G. Litavrin and A.P. Novosel'tsev, *Об Управлении Империей* (Moscow, 1989), pp. 158–159 and commentary pp. 391–394. Vernadsky, *Origins*, pp. 93–94.

voevoda ... because of his rank.⁹ The tradition of seven Magyar clans without the benefit of native or foreign princely rulership, but under the command of a military aristocracy, appears to apply as well to the Eastern Slavs.¹⁰ The term *князь*, though known to the Eastern Slavic tribes, seems alien to them and does not appear to have been adopted over an extensive area of Kievan Rus', nor is there evidence that the Eastern Slavs had developed a native and national hereditary ruling house. Rather, there developed the institution of *кормоды*, an outgrowth of tribal requirements, some chiefly associated with the Slavic *градды* and the defense of the local populace, and the protection of trade routes.

With the establishment of the Riurikid ruling house, time and again the predominant heads of this kin were confronted with Slavic tribal and urban rebellions. Frequently, then, the *кормоды* were instrumental in precipitating revolts for reasons of personal gain and local interest. Hence, the Rus' apologists viewed the *кормоды* as obstacles to Riurikid centralizing tendencies and orderly succession. They were not the sole source of discontent or rebellion. The presence of rival Varangian centers in northern Rus' made the task of the Riurikids all the more difficult, undermining their centralization efforts and gradual political advancement over Slavic and other peoples.

Extensive treatment is given in *ПБД*, as if to dispense with the topic once and for all, to the Kievan *кормода* Blud's role in Vladimir's rise to power.¹¹ This account, with an allusion to the *Psalter (Book of Psalms)* of the Old Testament, takes the form of an individual lament. The compiler of this passage stresses that Jaropolk, as David, was confronted with internal troubles in the absence of the necessity for the Kievan Rus' to stand as one against a common external enemy. David's problems arose when his third son, Absalom, contrived the murder of his eldest brother, Amnon. Several years later, Absalom then began to plot against his father, and David was forced to flee and to abandon Jerusalem to his rebellious son.¹²

A transference of evil takes place in *ПБД* and its compilers stress that Jaropolk had been surrounded by a malicious enemy and false friend

⁹ Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Administrando Imperio*, 1: 170–171. Note also G. Vernadsky and M. de Ferdinándy, *Studien zur ungarischen Frühgeschichte*, SA 47 (Munich, 1947): 21–26.

¹⁰ Constantine Porphyrogenetos, *De Administrando Imperio*, DOT 1: 170 ff.

¹¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 76–78; and 2: 63–66. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 92–93; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–127.

¹² Cf. 2 *Samuel*.

—Blud, his ranking commander and principal military advisor, who noting the prince's plight and military distress, conspired to betray him to Vladimir. Momentarily, however, we are conveyed the impression that the Rus' scribes favored the solitary rule of Jaropolk and placed the initiative for this treacherous act upon Vladimir, not Blud. *ПВЛ* records that Vladimir dispatched the following message to Blud:¹³

ПОПРНИАН МИ АЩЕ ОУБЬЮ БРАТА СВОЕГО· НМѢТИ ТѦ ХОЧЮ¹⁴ БО ШЦА МѢСТО· Н МНОГУ
ЧЕСТЬ ВОЗЬМЕШЬ ѿ МЕНЕ· НЕ АЗЪ БО ПОЧАЛЪ БРАТЬЮ БИТИ НО ОНЪ· АЗЪ ЖЕ ТОГО
ОУБОАВЪСА· ПРИДОУХЪ НА НЬ· Н РЕЧЕ БЛУДЪ КЪ ПОСЛОМЪ ВОЛОДИМЕРНМЪ· АЗЪ БУДУ
ТОБѢ В СРЦЕ Н ВЪ ПРИЗНАНЬСТЕ·

'Show me [your] friendliness if I slay my brother. I wish to have you in [my] father's place, and you will accept much honor from me. It is not I who began to fight [my] brother, but he. I feared for that [reason], [and] I have come against him.' And Blud said to Vladimir's messenger: 'I will be with you in [my] heart and in friendliness.'

But the full burden of guilt for this treacherous plot is placed upon Blud and Vladimir emerges absolved of wrongdoing.¹⁵

And further, the class of *БОЮВЪОДА* shares condemnation for this breach. *ПВЛ* furnishes the following explanation for its disapproval:¹⁶

¹³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 76; and 2: 64. Cf. *RPCLT*, 92; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–125, an emended version.

¹⁴ This usage may be a corruption, a textual lacuna, or simply an editorial revision. The *Hyapatian* redaction, *ПСРЛ* 2: 64, reads: *НМѢТИ ТѦ НАЧУ ВЪ ШЦА МѢСТО СВОѢ*, "I will begin to have you in my father's place," with no significant alteration in meaning. Later annals read as follows: *Н*, 3: 126, states: *ПОПРНИАН МИ· АЩЕ УБИЮ БРАТА СВОЕГО, ЛЮБИТИ ТѦ НАЧУ ВЪ ОТЦА МѢСТО СВОЕГО, Н МНОГУ ЧЕСТЬ ПРИНМЕШИ ОТ МЕНЕ· НЕ АЗЪ БО ПОЧАХЪ БРАТНЮ БИТИ, НЬ ОНЪ· АЗЪ ЖЕ ТОГО УБОАУХИА Н ПРИДОУХЪ НА НЬ. И РЕЧЕ БЛУДЪ КЪ ПОСЛАННЫМЪ ВОЛОДИМЕРОМЪ· АЗЪ БУДУ ТОБѢ ВЪ СЕРДЦЕ Н ВЪ ПРИЗНАНЬСТВО*, "Show me [your] friendliness, if I slay my brother. I [will] begin to love [to have] you in my father's place and you will accept many honors from me. It is not I who began to fight [my] brother, but he. I feared for that [reason], [and] I have come against him.' And Blud said to Vladimir's messenger: 'I will be with you in [my] heart and in friendliness.'" *Н*, 4: 54, identifies the messenger as the *БОЮВЪОДА* Jaropolk and the text follows *Н*; so also *С*, 5: 111; *В*, 7: 293; *ПН*, 9: 39, with slight emendation. The passage is modified in *ВЛ*, 30: 23; but is excised from *Т*, 15: 73–75; also not in *К*, 21/1: 69; and *НН*, 42: 42. *ННК* (Zenkovsky), p. 74, reads: "Then Vladimir sent his [agents] to Blud, Jaropolk's vovoda, cunningly saying, 'You must accept me. In case I kill my brother, Jaropolk, you will be my favorite and you will be in the place of my father, and you will be greatly honored by me. I did not start the fight among my brothers but he did, and I became frightened; therefore I marched against him.' Blud answered Vladimir's envoys, 'I will help and will be your friend.'" The passage is excised from *П*₁ (Nasonov), 1: 8; and *Тр* (Priselkov), p. 91, reads as *Н*. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 92; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–125.

¹⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 77; and 2: 65. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 92; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–127.

¹⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 77; and 2: 65. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 92; and *БЛДР* 1: 124–125.

ТО СУТЬ НЕИСТОБНИИ· НЪЖЕ ПРИЕМАШЕ ѿ КНЯЗЯ ИЛИ ѿ ШЕПѦНА СВОЕГО ЧЕСТЬ ЛИ
ДАРЫ· ТИ МЫСЛАТЬ ѿ ГЛАВѢ КНЯЗЯ СВОЕГО· НА ПАГУБЛЕНЬЕ· ГОРЬШЕ СУТЬ БѢГОВЪ
ТАКОВНИИ· ЯКОЖЕ БЛУДЪ ПРЕДА КНЯЗЯ СВОЕГО· И ПРИИМАЪ ѿ НЕГО ЧЪТИ МНОГИ[·] ЕЕ
БО БѢ ПОВИНЕНЪ КРОВИ ТОН·

They are unrestrained who, having received from the prince or from their lord honor or gifts, think of the perdition of their prince. They think of killing [him]. Such [men] are worse than devils. Thus Blud betrayed his prince, having received from him many honors. He is therefore guilty of his blood.

The question of law and succession are interrelated in this passage, and govern the affinity of the *ВОЮВОДА* to the prince. Nora K. Chadwick comments with sympathy upon the role of the *ВОЮВОДА* in princely succession and maintains¹⁷

... these [are the] native king-makers ... from father to son who govern the course of events, who control the careers of princes, who support them morally and materially in war and in peace, who guard their persons, and protect their honour and that of the nation in moments of danger and vacillation

And she further overstates:¹⁸

... the Norse rulers were largely dependent on them, not only for their position, but also for their maintenance and organization.

Although she does not make an explicit statement that the Norse *voevody* are similar in their roles and actions as those in Kievan Rus', we can surmise from the context of her discussion that this was so. But the *ПВЛ* scribes demonstrate a concern that the *ВОЮВОДА* lack a sense of national identity and of national monarchy transcending particularistic interests of individual principalities and tribes. Hence, the *ВОЮВОДА* are viewed as instruments of chaos and disorder. They are bound neither by tradition nor by law in the selection of ruling princes, thus this unrestrained element is free to support whichever candidate would bring them victory in battle and material rewards thereafter. Nowak, on the other hand, believes that the *ВѢЧЕ* exercised restraint upon the *ВОЮВОДА* and therefore the compilers of *ПВЛ* may be given to exaggeration in their dislike of this military aristocracy.¹⁹ Further, V.I. Sergeevich²⁰ correctly qualifies that the main role of this popular organ was the administration of land and political functions.

¹⁷ Chadwick, p. 116.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 117.

¹⁹ Nowak, p. 38.

²⁰ V.I. Sergeevich, *Древности русскаго права, 2: Вѣче и князь* (3rd ed., St. Petersburg, 1909): 72; and P.P. Tolochko, "Вече и народные движения в Киеве," in V.D. Koroliuk, et

But in 988, when Vladimir erected border fortifications along the approaches to Kiev to protect the urban center against Pecheneg raids,²¹

и поча нарѹбати мужѣ лучшиѣ ꙗ Словенѣ и ꙗ Кривичѣ и ꙗ Чюдѣ и ꙗ
Бѣлтичѣ и ꙗ снѹхъ насеан грады

he began to gather the best men from the Slovenes and the Krivichi, and from the Chud', and from the Vjatichi, and from these he populated the towns.

We could surmise that Vladimir had not abrogated dependence upon the *воѹбоды*, but valued their military skills and assigned them to duties along the frontiers of the realm. Hereafter then, during the course of the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian era, only scant references appear in the Rus' annals to this Slavic military aristocracy. Ironically, in this same period, no longer are they identified as Varangians. As for the Varangians, they too receive only scant mention in this era, demonstrating their demise as an influential force in Rus' political and military society. The Slavic military aristocracy after 1054 reemerges as a less passive element in the Kievan appanage period and involves itself in internecine strife among Jaroslav's and his sons' progeny.

The construction of *грады* in the seventh and eighth centuries introduced an additional innovation in these strongholds. These centers became the meeting place for the *вѣче* that were no longer limited to the role of being the representative councils for a particular clan or tribe. Their role was enlarged to become consultative bodies of town assemblies serving the governmental, that is, the secular and religious administrative and legislative needs of the fortified centers and of the surrounding countryside. The traditional and important place of the *вѣче* should not be minimized in Kievan Rus' history.²² This native institution first issued the call for the Riurikids to curtail discords among the numerous tribes of northern Rus' and to govern as a monolithic house,²³ and from the viewpoint of the Rus' scribes the town assemblies are honored for the achievement of bringing about the territorial unification of the Northeastern Slavs and others under one unitary authority. The succession of Vladimir, however, introduced acute problems. As we

al., *Исследования по истории славянских и балканских народов. Эпоха средневековья. Киевская Русь и ее славянские соседи* (Moscow, 1972), pp. 125–126.

²¹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 121; and 2: 106. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 119; and *БЛДР* 1: 164–167.

²² For the historiographic aspects of the *вѣче* question, cf. Shusharin, pp. 186–192; and K. Zernack, *Die burgstädtischen Volksversammlungen bei den Ost- und Westslaven. Studien zur verfassungsgeschichten Bedeutung des Veče* (Wiesbaden, 1967), pp. 15–29.

²³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 19–20; and 2: 14. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 59–60; and *БЛДР* 1: 74–75.

have observed for in the *ПВЛ* entry for 980, the Rus' scribes denounced the Slavic *КОУВОДАИ* as instruments of political anarchy and advocates of successional irregularity in the advancement of Riurikid princes to the princely seat at Kiev. *ПВЛ* for the same year makes a strong appeal for the retention of the *КЪЧЕ* as a voice in princely matters. As we have previously cited,²⁴ the Rus' scribes added the biblical admonition: "her husband is distinguished within the gates when he sits in council with the elders and inhabitants of the land." *ПВЛ* thus established a biblical justification for a substantial role of the *КЪЧЕ* in princely rulership, but we should recall that a parallel acceptance of shared authority exists in the Norse *konungr's* reliance upon the *Thing*.²⁵ A similar justification cannot be found in Byzantine political thought wherein the *βασιλεύς* rules as an autocrat, unchecked at least in theory in the degree of his authority.²⁶

ПВЛ provides an elaborate definition of the composition of the *КЪЧЕ* and defines the extent of the authority, which this body exercised over its populace. In 997 the inhabitants of Belgorod, a town located a short distance to the southwest of Kiev and under the siege of the Pechenegs, held a council to discuss the issues of famine and the failure of Vladimir to raise the siege and to provide adequate food supplies and other provisions. The town assembly convened and reached a decision to surrender to the Pechenegs, lest all of the inhabitants should succumb to starvation. But one of the elders who had not been present at the gathering, *ѣ слышавъ посла по старѣишныи градъскыи*, "having heard this, he sent for the urban-elders."²⁷ The institution of the urban-elder system is an extension of the tribal patriarchal custom. The primitive Slavs who first settled the western extension of the Pontic steppe established rural communities organized on the principal of the *родъ*, the kin, kinfolk or clan, an elemental socio-political unit common to most Indo-European peoples.²⁸ Fashioned upon the institution of the patriarchal family, wherein the eldest male member (*староста*) was the head of the kin or blood relations, the task of administering the basic needs fell upon the senior family member. The *староста* allocated the land held in

²⁴ Cf. *supra*, p. 30 and n. 65.

²⁵ Cf. *supra*, p. 114.

²⁶ Fedotov, *Russian Religious Mind*, 1: 399.

²⁷ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; and 2: 112. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 123; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

²⁸ Cf. M. Kovalevsky, *Russian Political Institutions: Growth and Development of these Institutions from the Beginnings of Russian History to the Present Time* (Chicago, 1902), pp. 13 ff.; Presniakov, *Лекции*, 1: 51–61; and Grekov, *Киевская Русь*, pp. 71–92.

common and other possessions necessary for the livelihood and defense of the kin. With the growth of urban communities, the *роуз* gave way to the formation of the *вече*, an assembly of family heads, although in practice all inhabitants of the urban community were entitled to partake in its deliberations. The right to summon the *вече* belonged to each member of the *роуз* and thereafter to the residents of a *градъ*. The urban elders, however, could only carry out *вече* decisions. Those of Belgorod reversed their initial decision to surrender and accepted the alternative proposal of an elder that led to an end of the siege. The Belgorod *вече* clearly wielded substantial jurisdiction over its populace.²⁹

Modern scholarship, on the other hand, is in disagreement on a precise definition of the *вече* and the composition of this body. Nowak draws a distinction without elaboration between the *вече* as a popular assembly and the council of elders,³⁰ maintaining that all political authority was vested in the former.³¹ D'iakonov defines the *вече* as a national assembly, which belies the fact that each *градъ* had its own *вече*.³² Zernack believes that the *ПБА* citations on the *вече* are twelfth-century emendations to the basic text and hence lead to a misreading of the earlier entries in the annal.³³ Dvornik subscribes to a more traditional interpretation, arguing that all Rus' towns had *вече* dominated by a class of elders, but included in its composition members of the populace.³⁴ There is little reason to believe, notwithstanding the recent attempts of scholars to ameliorate the definition of the *вече*, that the traditional explanation no longer remains valid. Textual evidence that substantive secretions were introduced into *ПБА* does not alter the basic character of this work. Frequent citations in this source and later annals, which draw upon this work, stress that the *вече* was composed of elders who administered the decisions of the body, though the town populace had representation and a voice in its deliberations.

The *ПБА* scribes entertained in behalf of the *вече* a claim for the body's participation in the process of princely rulership. The first among these series of actions was the right of the *вече* to place some restraints upon princely authority at the initial stage of the succession process, but

²⁹ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127–128; and 2: 112–113; Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 122–123; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–173.

³⁰ Nowak, p. 38.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

³² D'iakonov, *Очерки*, p. 95.

³³ Zernack, pp. 37–40.

³⁴ Dvornik, "Byzantine Political Ideas," p. 75.

introduced no limitations that could impede his powers once he had been formally designated. Specific citations are entered in *ПБЛ* in the intervening years between 980 and 1036 to establish the assembly's role in defining these relations, that is, the rights and liabilities of the Kievan prince to his subjects. The Rus' scribes unquestionably accept the inauguration of Vladimir's sovereignty through conquest and again Jaroslav's elevation to solitary rule upon the demise of his brother. These circumstances evidence providential pleasure and conform to the annalists' acceptance of a biblical historiographic tradition, but Svjatopolk and Mstislav are excepted from this process and are not accorded divine acknowledgment. In 1015 when Svjatopolk seized the seat in Kiev, he recognized his need to gain the approval for his power from the town's populace. Through gifts, or rather bribery, he entertained the hope that the Kievans would acknowledge his rule as its prince. The populace granted to him community confirmation, but *ПБЛ* stresses that their hearts were with Boris.³⁵ Svjatopolk's claim to authority, even though he had achieved this position through conquest and he was the eldest of the brothers, permits us therefore to argue that he had a legitimate claim to succession. But this argument is negated by *ПБЛ* and in this manner he is portrayed in a weak light. The annal concludes that the Kievans reserved for themselves the right to switch their allegiance to another prince. Later in the same year, Svjatopolk must have again realized that his hold upon the princely seat was tenuous and *ПБЛ* records his distribution of largess among the town's leaders, hence the elders in the *вѣчѣ*.³⁶ This source is imprecise in distinguishing between the populace in general and its chief representative organ—the *вѣчѣ*. Though not specifically identified, there is reason to believe that Svjatopolk's main link to the populace was through the intermediation of the elders in the *вѣчѣ*. It appears inconceivable that he would deal directly with the inhabitants of Kiev, whose population was rather sizeable, and confer upon all of them gifts to gain their allegiance.

The dual rule of Jaroslav and Mstislav complicated the role of the *вѣчѣ* in the successional issue. No discussion appears in the *ПБЛ* entries for 1016, 1019, or 1036 to establish community confirmation neither of Jaroslav's rule by the Kievans nor of Mstislav by the Chernigovians. Jaroslav's conquest of Kiev had been accomplished through the military support of the Nordic and

³⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 132; and 2: 118. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 126; and *БЛДР* 1: 176–177.

³⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 140; and 2: 127. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 130; and *БЛДР* 1: 184–185 and 507.

Slavic inhabitants of Novgorod.³⁷ *ПѢЛ* conveys the implication that once Kiev's populace had acknowledged his rule and admitted the establishment of his ruling seat in the town, they remained steadfast in their loyalty to the prince. In 1024, Mstislav sought to displace his brother and to locate his political center at Kiev. *ПѢЛ* relates that in the same year that the Kievans denied to Mstislav his wish, he thereafter maintained his seat at Chernigov.³⁸

The function of the *вѣче* in the lawmaking process stands in marked contrast during the reigns of Vladimir and Jaroslav. The Rus' scribes recognized the antiquities of the popular assembly,³⁹ and commented upon the role of this body in legislative deliberations upon secular as well as religious matters. Earlier we had established that the *родъ* was fashioned upon the institution of the patriarchal family wherein the eldest male member (*староста*) became the head of the kin or blood relations, and to this aspect of authority was added a pagan religious cult, ancestor worship. The main object of this devotion was the deification of the elder as the progenitor of his kin. Implied also were his protective powers over the clan, hence the need for the elder to legislate on secular and religious questions. The *вѣче* became the recipient of this tradition and until the Christianization of Kievan Rus' the elders in this popular assembly enjoyed the privilege to enact community rules for secular and religious stability and conformity.

But neither Vladimir nor Jaroslav desired to relinquish to the Kievan *вѣче* a legislative function. Each prince had gained his office through conquest and saw no need to recognize limitations upon their sovereign powers. This explains why then there is no mention made in the sources that the *вѣче* participated in legislative processes during the years from 980 to 1054. The scribes accepted the fact that customary law was established and it was the duty of the prince to apply the law justly and equitably. The *вѣче* could, however, furnish council to the prince on juridical usage in particular cases. Thus in 996, the only *ПѢЛ* reference to secular law for our period of study, the churchmen and elders admonished Vladimir to apply due process of law and to punish robbers. The *wergeld* so obtained could then be used for the purchase of arms and other forms of military necessities to defend the realm.⁴⁰ The *Русская Правда* issued by Jaroslav in 1015 acknowledged to his

³⁷ *Новгородская Лѣтопись по Синодальному Харатейному списку*, pp. 82–83.

³⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 147; and 2: 134–135. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 134; and *БЛДР* 1: 190–191.

³⁹ Cf. the textual citation in Sergeevich, *Древности русскаго права*, 2: 1.

⁴⁰ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; and 2: 112. Cf. *RPCLT*, 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

followers, which included elders, the existence of a customary law, but the institution of the *вѣче* is not singled out as possessing powers to modify this law. On the contrary, it is the prince who gave the law.⁴¹

The consultative role of the *вѣче* and its members is more discernible in religious matters, which especially required great attention following Vladimir's adoption of Christianity. Vladimir's course of action in 980 served as a guide for future determinations in similar religious cases. He recognized the religious and cultural symbiosis that had evolved between the Norse and Slavs inhabiting his principality. Vladimir, therefore, decreed the creation of a common pagan deity.⁴² Three years later he allowed the elders and *божры* to select suitable human sacrifices in thanksgiving to the gods for his military victory over the Jatvjangi.⁴³ And later in the same decade when Vladimir sought to abandon the primitive pagan cults, which he believed acted as a hindrance in his realm's relations with its neighbors and which act Vernadsky correctly interprets as a politically motivated gesture,⁴⁴ the prince consulted his *божры* and elders on the choice of a new religion.⁴⁵ The latter, who together with the *божры* are admitted in the *ПВЛ* entry for 987 as members of the prince's *дружина*, relinquish the decision to Vladimir.⁴⁶

Once the Kievan principality had been committed to Christianity, in matters of church legislation the *вѣче* was stripped of its traditional participation in such enactments. This may have caused the ecclesiastics some concern and explains the stress in *ПВЛ* upon the consultative function of the popular assembly. The Byzantine emperor issued religious laws and similarly the Rus' churchmen entrusted this authority to the prince. Vladimir and Jaroslav issued their respective church statutes with the full cognition that laymen could not adjudicate questions of ecclesiastical competence. Therefore, the elders in the *вѣче* witnessed the abrogation of a traditional function.⁴⁷

The *вѣче* as well suffered some diminution in its powers over territorial government, but this loss was not crucial for its survival as an institution, for its role had been largely local rather than national. *ПВЛ* relates that Vladimir⁴⁸

⁴¹ *Новгородская Лѣтопись по Синодальному Харатейному списку*, p. 84.

⁴² *ПСРЛ* 1: 79; and 2: 67. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 93–94; and *БЛДР* 1: 126–129.

⁴³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 82; and 2: 69. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 95; and *БЛДР* 1: 130–131.

⁴⁴ Cf. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 62ff. Note also similar interpretations, which appear in Presniakov, *Лекции*, 1: 98ff.; and Zernov, p. 425.

⁴⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 106 and 108; and 2: 93–94. Cf. *RPCLT*, pp. 110 and 111; and *БЛДР* 1: 152–155.

⁴⁶ *ПСРЛ* 1: 108; and 2: 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 111; and *БЛДР* 1: 154–155.

⁴⁷ These church statutes have been previously examined. Cf. *supra*, pp. 81–89.

⁴⁸ *ПСРЛ* 1: 126; and 2: 111. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

...люба дружинѹ н с ними думама ѡ строн земаленѣ н ѡ ратехъ н [о] оуставѣ земаленѣ

... [He] loved [his] followers, considering with them [questions] of land administration, and of war, and [of] land legislation.

A similar attribution, while denied to Jaroslav in *ПВЛ*, is ascribed to him in the family of Novgorodian annals.⁴⁹ Each prince consulted the *вѣче*, but too they sought the advice of their *бояры* and other retainers.

The family *рода* and even the *вѣче* negated the formation of a national political union.⁵⁰ With their roots in the tribal structure, it was a natural consequence that the *рода* and *вѣче* could not rise above interest in limited political unions.⁵¹ The appearance of a powerful Riurikid ruling house failed to move the *вѣче* to aspire to develop a broader political formation acting as a restraint upon princely powers.⁵² We do not find any evidence demonstrating the formation of a national popular assembly. Sergeevich's contention that two elements existed in the administration of the Kievan principality—the monarchic represented by the prince, and the popular represented by the *вѣче*—lacks credibility.⁵³ Such parity is not demonstrable in the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian era. D'iakonov is correct in establishing that the *вѣче* did not conform to a fixed schedule of meetings, but gathered infrequently. The prince, on the other hand, conducted his office on a daily schedule.⁵⁴ As *ПВЛ* relates, Vladimir, when seeking counsel, called upon the elders from the towns.⁵⁵ Jaroslav, however, is admitted in the sources to consult the *вѣче* individually and generally on local matters.⁵⁶

The image, which emerges in the Rus' sources for the three Slavic socio-political institutions—the *князи*, *боярство*, and *вѣче*—is dissimilar. The Rus' scribes recognized the similitude existing between the members of

⁴⁹ *Новгородская Лѣтопись по Синодальному Харатейному списку*, pp. 75 ff.

⁵⁰ Zernov, p. 425. Cf. I.A. Linnichenko, *Въче въ киевской области* (Kiev, 1881), *passim*; and B.D. Grekov, "Несколько замечаний о древнерусском вече," *УЗЛУ*, серия исторических наук 4/19 (1938): 146–162.

⁵¹ Sergeevich, *Древности русскаго права*, 2: 33–35.

⁵² Cf. the contrastive interpretations of Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, p. 211; and Paszkiewicz, *Origin*, p. 252.

⁵³ Sergeevich, *Лекции*, pp. 130–143.

⁵⁴ D'iakonov, pp. 46–48.

⁵⁵ *ПСРЛ* 1: 125; and *ibid.*, 2: 109. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 121; *БЛДР* 1: 168–169; and Sergeevich, *Древности русскаго права*, 2: 378.

⁵⁶ Cf. the numerous citations that appear in the several reactions of *ПВЛ* and the Novgorodian annals.

early Slavic tribal society and the ancient Israelite tribal structure. In a broad context, their problems were comparable. The Rus' writers approved with favor the Israelite perception that a royal king was the channel for divine blessings for his people. This fundamental principle further explains the Kievan princes' relationship to the Supreme Being and their maintenance of justice among their subjects. This basic doctrine also implied the maintenance of order and equity as prime ideals. A bond of union and a sacral tie had to be manifest between the princes and their subjects. Any alteration of this ancient covenant was interpreted as a blow against righteousness. The princes' enemies were therefore as well God's enemies.⁵⁷

The rural Slavic *князи* are not the subject of the Rus' scribes' derision. By Vladimir's reign, they have become an insignificant element and have been displaced in positions of authority by the Riurikid princes. The Rus' sources demonstrate no need to comment upon an institution that is antithetical to national interests and is identified with the tribal and commercial centers, but is now almost powerless.

The early Rus' annalists, however, direct their scorn upon the *вождь* and Blud becomes the chief representative of the maliciousness and calousness of his class. The *вождь* are condemned for keeping no law and for their self-serving interests. Then too, until the accession of Vladimir, there was no moral prohibition against their actions and consequently they received no reproof or retribution for their wrongs. They recognized no mutual obligations either to the prince or to his subjects. The Rus' scribes, as the biblical writers,⁵⁸ sought to elevate the principality above the forces of tribalism and provincial particularism. Hence, Vladimir, though he received the aid of Blud in gaining power, ushered in a new age and triumphed over the powers of chaos, the *вождь*. He subjugated their centers and these successes are portrayed as victories over the enemies of the people. In the account of Blud, *ПЛ* incorporates an injunction against the *вождь* and any act of rebellion against the prince's authority is equated as an act of disobedience against Divine Will. Thus *ПЛ* at the inception of Vladimir's reign reduces the *вождь* to obscurity through the use of a biblical prohibition and thereafter this class is denied a significant role in the determination of Kievan princely power.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Psalms*, lxxii. 1 ff.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, lv. 1 ff. For other borrowed phrases, cf. D.G. Ostrowski, "Identify Psalmic Quotations in the *Povest' Vremennykh Let*," in Martin and Spock, pp. 217–250.

The textual image of the *вѣче* is more difficult to assess. From the standpoint of the early Rus' scribes, one could find repeated examples in the books of the Old Testament stressing respect for one's elders. And the admonition incorporated in the acrostic on a virtuous wife clearly establishes the need for a participatory role of this body in the governance of the principality.⁵⁹ But there remains the contradictory sentiment that the *вѣче* as the *воиноводы* had been instruments of national disruption. Perhaps the clearest example of such centrifugal tendencies was demonstrated repeatedly by the Novgorodian *вѣче* in its relations with the Kievan principality.⁶⁰ The Rus' scribes, however, overlook the actions of the *вѣче* during the pre-Christian era and seek rather to reconcile the functions of these institutions with a monolithic ruling house.

But once the Rus' annalists denied to the *вѣче* the existence of a role in their traditional legislative and administrative functions and a role in secular and ecclesiastical matters, the scribes appear to have a compulsion to demonstrate a substitutive role for the popular assemblies *vis-à-vis* the ruling prince. The notion evolves that as the Kievan prince is a link between God and the ruler's subjects, so the elders are an intermediary between prince and the populace. Understandably, it was simply impractical for the prince to deal directly with the populace as a whole and he had need for an intermediary. Further, Vladimir and his sons, through baptism, had inherited from the Byzantines and their reading of the books of the Old Testament a Judeo-Christian notion of monarchy and of the God-given authority of the prince. The elders and their *вѣче* are in this way entrusted with a consultative role, advising the prince when he has need for their counsel. The accounts depicting Vladimir's reign are replete with references to such an obligation. Jaroslav's rule, on the other hand, is noteworthy for the absence of similar citations and his apparent negation of reliance upon such counsel.

There remains one additional question regarding the role of the *вѣче*. Does *ПѢД* seek to imply that on the occasion when Vladimir examined several religious creeds there existed a national popular assembly? Or had the Kievan *вѣче* assumed this role and identified itself as the exponent of a national will as Sergeevich argues?⁶¹ For 987 *ПѢД* records that Vladimir

⁵⁹ *Proverbs*, xxxi. 10–31. For a broad treatment of this institution, cf. Danilevsky, *Древняя Русь глазами современников и потомков (IX–XII вв.)*. Курс лекции, pp. 86–101.

⁶⁰ Hanak, "New Introduction," pp. xlv ff.

⁶¹ Sergeevich, *Древности русского права*, 2: 33. Cf. V.O. Kliuchevsky, *Боярская дума древней Руси* (5th ed., Petrograd, 1919), pp. 13 ff.

summoned together his *БОЛЯРЫ* and apparently the elders of the town of Kiev.⁶² Later, for 996, this annal in its *Hyapatian* redaction recites that he celebrated his escape from Pecheneg capture and summoned to a feast *БОЛЯРЫ, ПОСАДНИКЫ* and *СТАРУШИННЫ ПО ВСѢМЪ ГРАДОМЪ · И ЛЮДИ МНОГЫ*; “elders throughout all the towns and many people.”⁶³ The latter entry, a solitary notice of a prince calling upon the elders from the towns, seems to infer that Vladimir looked upon the Pecheneg attack as a threat to the entire principality and therefore his celebration was to be conducted as a national event. The prince may have contemplated at this time the formation of a national advisory body composed of elders from the Rus’ towns. However, we read nowhere in the annals of a Kievan reaction against this gathering, even though their preeminent interests might have been at stake. Then again throughout his rule Vladimir demonstrated a greater dependence upon the advice of the elders, whether Kievan or other towns, than did his son Jaroslav. But Vladimir’s enthusiasm for the creation of a national consultative assembly must have soon waned. No further mention appears in the sources that either he or his son called upon the elders from the towns for advice and consent for princely proposals.

Does this then establish the town of Kiev, the mother of Rus’ princely urban centers, in a matriarchal role above other urban centers and admit her *ВѢЧЕ* as the spokeswoman for Rus’ popular wishes? *ПВЛ* clearly shows partiality toward Kiev and excludes from her assembly the participation of elders from other towns. The Rus’ scribes, perhaps in the tradition of Constantinople, may have emerged as opponents of the notion of an interurban assembly and moved toward the recognition of the Kievan *ВѢЧЕ* in the role of a national popular convocation. The biblical acrostic on a virtuous wife supports this interpretation. We read of no later struggle among the several *ВѢЧА* for preeminence in giving direction to princely affairs. An absence of such discussion might imply that in the last decades of Vladimir’s rule a struggle, though bloodless, did ensue. *ПВЛ* makes much ado over Jaroslav’s rebellion against his father in 1014. The issue between them stemmed from the Novgorodian prince’s unwillingness to render annual tribute to Vladimir. In this dispute, however, Jaroslav had the support of the Novgorodian *ВѢЧЕ*.⁶⁴ His experiences with the Novgorodian assembly and its particularistic interests

⁶² *ПСРЛ* 1: 108; and 2: 94. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 111; and *БЛДР* 1: 152–153.

⁶³ *ПСРЛ* 1: 125; and 2: 109. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 121; and *БЛДР* 1: 168–169.

⁶⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 130; and 2: 114–115. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 124; and *БЛДР* 1: 172–173.

could explain why Jaroslav never viewed the Kievan *вѣче* in any other light than that of an assembly representing local interests. After he established his seat in Kiev, he tolerated the existence of their *вѣче*, but denied to them a national function. After his death, a number of *вѣча* emerge as proponents of local particularism and supporters of political divisiveness.

The native Slavic institutions of *князи* and *кормоды* are clearly subordinated over the course of decades to the will of an able Riurikid ruling house. Thus these two bodies have no appreciable impact upon the formation of Kievan princely power. The *вѣча* in the numerous towns suffer some diminution of their traditional powers, but on the basis of biblical accounts the Kiev assembly at least is assigned a part in the confirmation proceedings of a prince and is entrusted with the task to give counsel to its prince. The Rus' scribes avoid any discussion whereby the popular assembly might undermine the authority of a legitimate ruling prince. Once installed in office, the *вѣче* of Kiev demonstrates a perfunctory interest in the exercise of its prince's powers.

CHAPTER SIX

SOME CONCLUSIONS

Early Rus' writers, recording and elaborating upon the era of Vladimirian-Jaroslavian rule, were concerned with questions, which they deemed essential in the formulation of the powers of a national dynasty. First, however, the scribes had to reconcile the role of these princes in a newly Christianized state with a well-established pagan past, and this they believed could be achieved through the creation of a recognizable philosophy of history or a central view concerning the nature and the image of Kievan princely power.

The primary vehicle for the conceptualization of a Rus' historiographic tradition was the Old Testament. As the ancient Jewish scribes, the Rus' had survived a period of political turmoil and the absence of national cohesiveness. Centralized authority, heretofore, had not been visible. But David and Solomon, and then Vladimir, ushered in a new era of monarchic rule over a unified land. Divine Providence had then willed these creations, so the scribes maintained. The early Rus' scribes accepted such a formulation and through the mediating agency of biblical tradition, Rus' writers expressed their divine pleasure at the foundation of a Christianized Rus' state. And the books of the Old Testament helped to give expression to the existence of a sovereign nation, ruled by a prince whose authority demonstrated parallelisms with the ancient Hebrew kings.

A striking omission, nevertheless, appears in the Rus' written accounts. Clearly, *ПѢЛ* and other Rus' works establish that the Kievan princes were the appointed of God, but paradoxically, unlike Solomon,¹ no statement appears in these writings that either Vladimir or Jaroslav beseeched the Lord to grant them the spirit of justice and righteousness, and thus to assist them in the judgment of their subjects. Interpretations of God's will are reserved for the Rus' clergy. We are told only that *ѡНѢВѢШЕ ЖЕ ВОЛОДОМШРЪ В СТРАСѢ БѢЖИ*, "Vladimir lived in the fear of God."² His progeny are also denied divine supplication.

¹ *IKings* iii. 9–13; and *IIChronicles* i. 7–13.

² *ПСП* 1: 126; and 2: 111. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

Having been deprived of such dependence, the Rus' scribes created a historiographic tradition that explained the powers of the Kievan princes in more pragmatic terms. A synthesization of their thoughts appears in the 996 *ПВЛ* entry. As we have previously observed, bandits and an irresolute prince troubled the ecclesiastics.³ The clerics and apparently the *кѣчѣ* of Kiev censored Vladimir for his inactions in dealing with banditry. Citing the full passage, the bishops reproved him with the counsel:⁴

ТЫ ПОСТАВЛЕНЪ ЕСИ ѿ БѢ на казнѣ злымъ а добрымъ на мнлованьѣ до-
тонѣ ти казнити разбонника но го испытомъ Володомѣрѣ же отвергъ вѣры
нача казнити разбонники и рѣша епѣпи и старци рать многа шже вѣра то на
шрѣжыи и на коннѣ буди и рѣ Володнмерѣ [тѣ боу и живѣш во о днмерѣ] по
ѡтросенью штьню и дѣдню:

You are the elect of God for the chastisement of evil and the granting of mercy to the good. It is fitting that you should punish robbers, but after trial. Vladimir set aside *wergild* [and] began to execute the robbers. And the bishops and elders said: 'War [is] frequent [and it] would be [better to use] the *wergild* for arms and horses.' And Vladimir replied: 'So it will be.' And Vladimir lived according to the prescriptions of his father and grandfather.

Two salient notions are incorporated in this passage, providing a notion of the nature of the princely office. The first part of the text stresses a theocratic concept of Kievan princely rulership, a product of the Judeo-Christian tradition. It reveals at the same time that the Rus' bishops and other high church ecclesiastics did not seek to acquire for themselves secular control of the state.⁵ Rather, as Kliuchevsky stresses, the Christian sovereign is the appointed of the Supreme Being to establish and to maintain the internal order within his state equally with its external security.⁶ We should not, however, overlook the fact that the Kievan prince was memorialized as an ideal ruler, though incarnate, and he was the source of all law and justice. And further, he was to be the benefactor, savior, shepherd, and father of his people. No claim appears in the first part of this account that the Kievan prince possessed absolute powers, only that his rule is to be tolerable and acceptable to his subjects. Poppe validly concludes that the prince was both the protector and the defender of the church, and hence he was able to rule in the image and likeness of God,⁷ avoiding disorder whenever possible.

³ Cf. *supra*, pp. 45–46.

⁴ *ПСРЛ* 1: 127; and 2: 111–112. Cf. *RPCLT*, p. 122; and *БЛДР* 1: 170–171.

⁵ Paszkiewicz, *Making*, p. 222.

⁶ Kliuchevsky, *Кѣчѣ*, 1: 88.

⁷ Poppe, *Państwo*, p. 251.

The second part of the passage elaborates upon the Kievan Rus' princes as products of natural political growth, meeting the expectations of the Rus' nation and providing for the welfare and safety of their subjects. The primary function of the princes' office is lawgiving, together with the dispensation of justice and the military protection of the principality. In the Rus' sources, customary law is not interpreted as evil by the churchmen, but valid for the orderly and correct governance of the nation. The emphasis upon these practical attributes of power had its corresponding expression in the enunciation of church laws. This explains why the ecclesiastics and elders of Rus' society, noting the commonality of their interests in the application of laws, interceded to implore the Kievan prince to execute this and the other main functions in his position of authority.

The Rus' acceptance of Christianity did not alter their outlook toward customary law. The religious writers accepted these secular norms as a necessary concomitant for the orderly conduct of government. Vladimir's *Уставъ* established the prerogative of the prince to issue in addition ecclesiastical laws for the regulation of this church body. Though Vladimir adhered to Byzantine precedence in the issuance of canonical prescriptions, once the custom had been established in the Kievan principality, the Rus' princes demonstrated an unwillingness to display sole dependence upon Greek ecclesiastical guidance. Jaroslav, therefore, stresses in his *Уставъ* that he proclaimed his statute⁸

ПО ДАНИЮ ОТАЦА СВОЕГО, СЪГАДАЛА ЕСТЬ СЪ МИТРОПОЛИТОМЪ КНЕВЬСКИИМЪ И ВСЕА
РЪЕН ИЛАРИОНОМЪ, СЛОЖИХОУМЪ ГРЕЧЕСКИИ НОМОКАНОНЪ....

in accordance with the bequest of his father, I have consulted with Hilarion, the Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Rus' [being] written in the Greek Nomokanon

The lawmaking authority of the prince established that the principality existed for the realization of secular and religious legal conformity, and the prince was the rightful holder of power for the enforcement of these norms. But the formulation of the lawmaking prerogatives had its inception in the Nordic-Slavonic heritage and Byzantine juristic practices served to define the application of legal standards in accordance with Christian canons. And further, the prince, though conceptualized as an ideal Christian ruler who governs by Divine Grace and appointment, remained subject to the secular and religious law unlike the Byzantine conception of rulership wherein the emperor at least in theory was above the law.

⁸ Beneshevich, *Сборник*, 1: 78.

On the other hand, Rus' writers were neither ethnocentric nor religious chauvinists in reporting the main events of the Vladimirian-Jaroslavian cycle. They were keenly aware of the Rus' heritage as a composite of Slavonic and Nordic elements in the main, but they were also cognizant that their state stood at the crossroads of numerous political, cultural, intellectual, and religious currents. Given their extensive variety of exposures, it became essential for the Rus' apologists to create a central view of the practical attributes of princely power, though objectivity was not a requisite in their methodology. The descriptions modeled chiefly after biblical figures, denotes a notion of authority in which two traditions predominate. The secular aspects of princely authority display a preponderant Nordic influence and assign to the Eastern Slavs a consultative role. The Riurikids pressed their family's role in the governance of the principality and thereafter we note the Rus' scribes' acceptance of the inculcation of Scandinavian notions of sovereignty, succession, eligibility to rule, legitimacy, lawmaking, military defense, popular confirmation, and so forth. Though many Eastern Slavic towns and tribal centers showed reluctance to accept unified rule under Riurikid patronage, Nordic institutions and practices were not too far removed from the Slavic. Then too, other advantages, primarily commercial, were to be realized with unified rule. The religious aspects of Kievan princely power are distinctively Byzantine after the Rus' conversion. Vladimir and Jaroslav emerge in the early Rus' writings as ideal Christian princes who possess autocratic powers in the Greek political tradition and have now received the symbols of office beholden to a Christian ruler. They are the sovereign heads of a princely state whose independence from imperial claims can be maintained by drawing upon biblical accounts.

Thus having brought on an independent historiographic tradition based upon the books of the Old Testament and yet aware of the Slavic, Nordic, and Byzantine currents, which help to explain the nature and the image of princely rulership, the Rus' annalists and apologists sought to preserve their image of princely power. Occasionally then, contradictions appear in the texts and the idea of this authority does not necessarily conform to the realities of this power.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Sources and Collections of Sources

- Abramovich, D.I. *Житія святыхъ мучениковъ Бориса и Гльба и службы имъ*. Памятники Древне-Русской Литературы, 2-й том. Petrograd, 1916.
- Adam of Bremen. "Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum." *PL* 146. Paris, 1884.
- . "Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum." *MGH, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*. Ed. B. Schmeidler. Hanover and Leipzig, 1917.
- . *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*. Trans. F.J. Tschan. Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, no. 53. New York, 1959; repr. 2002.
- Annales Bertiniani*. *MGH, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*. Ed. G.H. Pertz. Vol. 1. Hanover, 1826.
- . Ed. G. Waitz. Hanover, 1883.
- Археографическая Коммиссія. *Новгородская Лѣтопись по Синодальному Харатейному списку*. St. Petersburg, 1888.
- . *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей*. Vols. 1–. St. Petersburg, 1841–.
- Barker, E., ed. and trans. *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: From Justinian I to the Last Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents*. Oxford, 1961.
- Bartoletti Colombo, Anna Maria, ed. *Novellae*. Milan, 1986–.
- Beneshevich, V.N. *Древнеславянская кормчая XIV титуловъ безъ толкованій*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1906; repr. Sofia, 1987.
- . *Joannis Scholastici sinagoga L titularum ceteraque eiusdem opera iuridica*. ABAW, Philosophisch-historische Abteilung, Neue Folge, Heft 14. Vol. 1. Munich, 1937.
- . *Каноническій сборникъ XIV титуловъ со второй четверти VII вѣка до 883 г. К древнѣйшей исторіи источниковъ права греко-восточной церкви*. St. Petersburg, 1905; repr., SB 2a, Leipzig, 1974.
- . *Сборникъ памятниковъ по исторіи церковнаго права, преимущественно русскаго, кончая временемъ Петра Великаго*. Vol. 1. Petrograd, 1914.
- . *Синагога въ 50 титуловъ и другіе юридическіе сборники Иоанна Схоластика. Къ древнѣйшей исторіи источниковъ права греко-восточной церкви*. St. Petersburg, 1914.
- . *Syntagma XIV titularum sine scholiis secundum versionem palaeo-slovenicam* SB 2b. Leipzig, 1974.
- Benz, E., et al., eds. and trans. *Russische Heiligenlegenden*. Zurich, 1953.
- Brunner, H. *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1906.
- Bruno of Querfurt. *PL* 144. Paris, 1882.
- Bugoslavskii, S.A. *Україно-руські пам'ятки XI-XVIII ст. про князів Бориса та Гльба*. Kiev, 1928.
- Collin, H.S., and J. Schlyter, eds. *Corpus Juris Sueo-Gotorom Antiqui*. Vol. 1. Stockholm, 1827.

- Constantine Porphyrogenetos. *De Administrando Imperio*. Ed. Gy. Moravcsik and trans. R.J.H. Jenkins. DOT 1/CFHB 1. New, rev. ed. Washington, 1967; 2nd rev. ed. Washington, 2009.
- . *De Administrando Imperio*. Vol. 2: *Commentary*. F. Dvornik, et al. Ed. R.J.H. Jenkins. London, 1962.
- . *Об управлении империей*. Trans. G.G. Litavrin and A.P. Novosel'tsev. Moscow, 1989.
- . *De Cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*. Ed. J.J. Reiske. CSHB. Vol. 1. Bonn, 1829.
- . *De Cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*. Ed. J.-P. Migne. PG 112. Paris, 1859.
- . *Le livre des cérémonies*. Ed. A. Vogt. 2 vols. Paris, 1967.
- Continuator Regionis*. Ed. F. Kurze. *MGH, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*. Hanover, 1890.
- Cross, S.H. "The Russian Primary Chronicle." *HSNPL* 12 (1930). Pp. 76–320.
- , and O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, trans. and eds. *The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text*. Publication. The Medieval Academy of America 60. Cambridge, MA, 1953.
- De Boor, C., ed. *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*. Vol. 1. Leipzig, 1904.
- De Goeje, M. *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*. Vols. 1, 2, 6, and 7. Leiden, 1870–1894.
- Dewey, H.W., and Ann M. Kleimola, trans. with commentary. *Zakon Sudnyj Ljudem (Court Law for the People)*. Michigan Slavic Materials 14. Ann Arbor, 1977.
- Dietze, J., ed. *Die erste Novgoroder Chronik nach ihrer ältesten Redaktion (Synodalhandschrift) 1016–1333/1352: Edition des altrussischen Textes und Faksimile der Handschrift im Nachdruck*. Munich, 1971.
- Długosz, Jan. *Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae*. Warsaw, 1964.
- Dölger, F. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit)*. Vol. 1. Munich-Berlin, 1924–.
- Dzhakson, Tat'iana N. *Исландские королевские саги о Восточной Европе (первая треть XI в.): Тексты, перевод, комментарий*. Moscow, 1994.
- Freshfield, E.H. *A Manual of Roman Law: The Ecloga Published by Emperors Leo III and Constantine V of Isauria at Constantinople A.D. 726*. Cambridge, 1926.
- Fritzler, K. *Zwei Abhandlungen über altrussisches Recht*. Berlin and Leipzig, 1923.
- Gardīzi. *Zayn al-Akhbar*. V.V. Bartold, ed. ЗИАН, series 8, I, 4 (1897).
- Goetz, L.K. *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands, nebst Geschichte des russischen Kirchenrechts*. Stuttgart, 1905.
- Gorsky, A.B. *Памятники духовной литературы времени великаго князя Ярослава I-ого*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1844.
- Gregoras, Nikephoros. *Ἱστορία Ῥωμαϊκή*. Ed. L. Schopen. Vols. 1 and 2. Bonn, 1829–1830. Vol. 3. Ed. I. Bekker. Bonn, 1855.
- . *Correspondance de Nicéphora Grégoras*. Ed. R. Guiland. Paris, 1927.
- Grekov, B.D. *Правда Русская*. 3 vols. Moscow and Leningrad, 1940–1963.
- Harkavy, A.E. *Сказанія Мусульманскихъ писателей о Славянахъ и Русскихъ. (Съ половины VII вѣка до конца X вѣка по р. х.)*. St. Petersburg, 1870; repr., The Hague-Paris, 1969.
- . *Дополненія къ сочиненію "Сказанія Мусульманскихъ писателей о Славянахъ и Русскихъ"*. St. Petersburg, 1871.

- Hollingsworth, P., trans. *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*. Harvard Library of Ukrainian Literature 2. Cambridge, MA, 1992.
- Hudud al-Alam. *The Regions of the World, A Persian Geography 372 A.H.—982 A.D.* V. Minorsky, trans. London, 1937; 2nd ed., London, 1970.
- Ibn Khordādhbeh. *Kitāb al-masālik wa'l-mamālik*. BGA 6. Leiden, 1889.
- Ibn-Rusta. BGA 7. Leiden, 1894.
- Ibrahim ibn Jakub (Ben Yakub). *Relacja Ibrāhīma ibn Ja'kūba z podróży do krajów słowiańskich w przekazie al-Bekrieo*. Ed. T. Kowalski. MPH, new series. Vol. 1. Cracow, 1946.
- Ibrahim al-Istakhri. *Masālik ul-Mamālik*. BGA 1. Leiden, 1870.
- Ioannis Skylitzes. *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*. Ed. I. Thurn. CFHB 5. Berlin, 1973.
- . *John Scylitzes. A Synopsis of Byzantine History, 811–1057*. J. Wortley, trans. Cambridge, 2010.
- Istrin, V.M., ed. *Хроника Георгия Амартола въ древнемъ славянорусскомъ переводѣ*. Vol. 1: *Текстъ*. Petrograd, 1920.
- . *Die Chronik des Georgios Hamartolos*. Vol. 1. Slavische Propyläen 135. Munich, 1972.
- Iushkov, S.V. "Правосудие Митрополичие." *ЛЗАК* 35 (1929). Pp. 115–120.
- . *Уставъ кн. Владимира. (Историко-юридическое изслѣдованіе). Изслѣдованія по исторіи Русскаго права*. Вып. 1. Саратовское Общество исторіи, археологіи и этнографіи. N.p., n.d.
- . *Устав князя Владимира*. Novouzensk, 1926.
- Kaldellis, A., and D. Krallis, trans., *Michael Attaleiates: The History*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 16 (Cambridge, MA, and London, 2012).
- Katakouzenos, Ioannes. *Ἱστορία*. Ed. J. Schopen. 3 vols. Bonn, 1828–1832.
- Kedrenos, Georgios. *Σύνοψις ἱστορίων*. Ed. I. Bekker. CSHB. 2 vols. Bonn, 1838–1839.
- Kokovtsov, P.K. *Еврейско-хазарская переписка в X века*. Leningrad, 1932.
- Kovalevsky, A.P. *Книга Ахмада Ибн-Фадлана о его путешествии на Волгу в 921–922 гг.* Kharkov, 1956.
- Krachkovsky, I.Iu. *Путешествие Ибн-Фадлана на Волгу: перевод и комментарий*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1939.
- Kroll, W., et al., eds. *Corpus Juris Civilis*. Hildesheim, 1989.
- Krueger, P., ed. *Codex Justinianus*. Berlin, 1877.
- . *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. Vol. 2. 9th ed., Berlin, 1915; reissue Hildesheim, 1991.
- Lenhoff, Gail D., and N.N. Pokrovsky, eds. *Степенная книга царскаго родословія по древнейшимъ спискамъ*. 3 vols. Moscow, 2008–2012.
- Leo Diaconos. *Leon Diaconii Caloënsis historiae libri decem*. Ed. C.B. Hase. CSHB. Bonn, 1838.
- . *The History of Leo the Deacon: Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century*. Introduction, trans., and annotation by Alice-Mary Talbot and D.F. Sullivan. DOS 41. Washington, 2005.
- Likhachev, D.S., et al., eds. *Библиотека литературы древней Руси*. Vol. 1: *XI–XII века*. St. Petersburg, 1997.
- , and V.A. Romanov. *Повесть временных лет*. 2 vols. Moscow and Leningrad, 1950.

- Lipshits, Elena E., ed. *Еклога: Византийский законодательный свод VIII века*. Moscow, 1965. Retrans. and expanded by M.Ia. Siuziumov, *Еклога: Византийский законодательный свод. VIII века*. Riazan, 2006.
- Mango, C.A., trans. *The Homilies of Photios, Patriarch of Constantinople*. English Translation, Introduction and Commentary. DOS 3. Cambridge, MA, 1958.
- Marvazī. *Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhir Marvazī on China, the Turks and India*. V. Minorsky, trans. and commentary. London, 1942.
- Mas'ūdi. *Les Prairies d'or*. C. Barbier de Meynard and P. de Courteille, eds. and trans. Vol. 2. Paris, 1863.
- Michael Attaleiates. *Ἱστορία*. Ed. I. Bekker. CSHB. Bonn, 1853.
- Michell, R., and N. Forbes. *The Chronicle of Novgorod, 1016–1471*. With a “New Introduction” by W.K. Hanak. Repr., Hattiesburg, 1970.
- Migne, J.-P. *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeco-latina*. Vol. 112. Paris, 1859.
- . *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*. Vols. 144 and 146. Paris, 1882 and 1884.
- Müller, L. *Die altrussischen hagiographischen Erzählungen und liturgischen Dichtungen über die Heiligen Boris und Gleb*. Munich, 1967.
- . *Die Nestorchronik: Die altrussische Chronik, zugeschrieben dem Mönch des Kiever Höhlenkloster Nestor, in der Redaktion des Abtes Sil'vestr aus dem Jahre 116, rekonstruiert nach den Handschriften Lavrent'evskaja, Radzivilovskaja, Akademičeskaja, Troickaja, Ipat'evskaja und Chlebnikovskaja und ins Deutsche übersetzt*. Munich, 2001.
- Nasonov, A.N., ed. *Псковские летописи*. Vol. 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1941; vol. 2, Moscow, 1955.
- Nikol'sky, N.K., ed. “Слово о Законе и Благодати.” In *Матеріаліи для древнерусской духовной литературы*. СОРЯС 82. St. Petersburg, 1907. Pp. 28–55 and 75–122.
- Nikon, Patriarch. *Кормчая книга*. 1st ed. Moscow, 1650.
- Ostrowski, D.G., ed., et al. *The Povēst' vremennykh lēt. An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts 10. Vol. 1, part 1. Cambridge, MA, 2003.
- Pitra, J.B., ed. *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*. Vol. 2. Rome, 1868.
- Ponomarev, A.I., ed. *Памятники древне-русской церковно-учительной литературы*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1894.
- Priselkov, M.D. *Троицкая Летопись. Реконструкция текста*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1950.
- Pritsak, O., ed. *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Četvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Texts 8. Cambridge, MA, 1990.
- Psellos, Michael. *Chronographia*. E. Renauld, ed. Vol. 1. Paris, 1926.
- . *Fourteen Byzantine Rulers. The Chronographia of Michael Psellus*. Trans. E.R.A. Sewter. Harmondsworth, 1953.
- Rafn, C.C., ed. *Antiquités russes d'après les monuments historiques de Islandais et des anciens Scandinaves*. 2 vols. Copenhagen, 1850–1852.
- Regel, W., ed. *Analecta Byzantino-Russica*. St. Petersburg, 1891.
- Rhalles, G.A., and M. Potles. *Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καὶ Ἱερῶν Κανόνων κτλ.* Vol. 1. Athens, 1852.

- Russian Archeographic Commission. *Памятники древне-русского канонического права*. Part 2, no. 1. РИБ 36. Petrograd, 1920.
- . *Уставъ святого великаго князя Владимира о церковныхъ судахъ и о десятинахъ*. Petrograd, 1915.
- Saxo Grammaticus. *The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus* O. Elton, trans. Publication of the Folklore Society 33. London, 1894.
- Сборникъ въ память святого равноапостольнаго князя Владимира*. Petrograd, 1917.
- Schoell, R., and W. Kroll. *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. Vol. 3. Berlin, 1923; reissued Hildesheim, 1993.
- Sephton, J. *The Saga of King Olaf Tryggwason Who Reigned over Norway A.D. 995 to A.D. 1000*. London, 1895.
- Serbina, K.N., ed. *Устюжский летописный свод. (Архангелогородский летописец)*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1950.
- Serebriansky, N. *Древне-русскія княжескія житія. (Обзоръ редакціи и тексты)*. Vol. 2. Moscow, 1915.
- Shakhmatov, A.A. *Повѣсть временныхъ лѣтъ*. Petrograd, 1916.
- , and P.A. Lavrov, eds. *Сборникъ XII вѣка Московскаго Успенскаго Собора*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1899.
- Snorri Sturluson. *Heimskringla: History of the Kings of Norway*. L.M. Hollander, trans. Austin, 1964; repr. 1991.
- . *Heimskringla or the Lives of the Norse Kings*. E. Monsen, ed., and A.H. Smith, trans. Cambridge, 1932.
- Spulber, C.A. *L'Eclogue des Isauriens*. Cernauti, 1929.
- Sreznevsky, I.I. *Сказанія о святыхъ Борись и Гльбѣ. Сильвестровскій списокъ XIV вѣка*. St. Petersburg, 1860.
- Sreznevsky, V.I. *Память и похвала кн. Владимиру и его житіе, по списку 1494 г.* ЗИАН, series 8, 1 (1897). Pp. 1–12.
- . *Мусин-Пушкинскій Сборникъ 1414 года* St. Petersburg, 1893.
- , ed. *Славянскій переводъ хроники Симеона Логовета*. St. Petersburg, 1909; repr., *Slavjanskij perevod chroniki Simeona Logotheta*. London, 1971; and repr. *Die Chronik des Symeon Metaphrastes und Logothetes*. Slavische Propyläen 99. Munich, 1971.
- Stubbs, W., ed. *Select Charters and Other Illustrations: English Constitutional History from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward the First*. 9th ed. Oxford, 1913.
- Szefel, M., and A. Eck. *Documents de droit public relatifs à la Russie médiévale*. Bruxelles, 1963.
- Thietmar. *Chronici libri VIII*. Ed. F. Kurze. Hanover, 1889.
- Tikhomirov, M.N., ed. *Хрестоматія по истории СССР. С древнейших времен до конца XV века*. Moscow, 1960.
- . *Мерило праведное по рукописи XIV века*. Moscow, 1961.
- . *Новгородская харатейная летопись*. Moscow, 1964.
- . *Закон судный людем. Краткой редакци*. Moscow, 1961.
- . *Закон судный людем. Пространной и сводной редакци*. Moscow, 1961.
- Vernadsky, G. *Medieval Russian Laws*. Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies 41. New York, 1947.

- Voelli, G., and H. Justelli, eds. *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris* Vol. 2. Paris, 1661.
- Von Muralt, E., ed. *Χρονικὸν σύντομον ἐκ διάφορων χρονογράφων τε καὶ ἐξηγητῶν συλλεγὲν καὶ συντεφέν ὑπὸ Γεωργίου Ἀμαρτωλοῦ Μοναχοῦ. Χρονογραφὴ Γεωργία Αμαρτολα*. St. Petersburg, 1859.
- Wahlgren, S., ed. *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*. CFHB 44/1. Berlin and New York, 2006.
- Watson, A., trans. *The Digest of Justinian*. 2 vols. Rev. ed., Philadelphia, 1998; reissued Philadelphia, 2008.
- Zachariae von Lingenthal, K.E., ed. *Collectio librorum iuris graeco-romanii Eclogam Leonis et Constantini, Epanagogen Basilii Leonis et Alexandri continens*. Leipzig, 1852.
- . *Novellae Iustiniani, Imp. Iustiniani Novellae quae vocantur* 2 vols. Leipzig, 1881.
- . *Ὁ Πρόχειρος Νόμος* Heidelberg, 1837.
- Zenkovsky, S.A., and Betty J. Zenkovsky. *The Nikonian Chronicle From the Beginning to the Year 1132*. Vol. 1. Princeton, 1984.
- Zepos, J., and P. Zepos, eds. *Jus graeco-romanum*. Vol. 2. Athens, 1931.
- Zimin, A.A., ed. *Памятники русского права*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1952.
- . “Память и похвала Иакона мниха и Житие князя Владимира по древнейшем списке.” *Краткие сообщения Института славяноведения* 37 (1963). Pp. 66–75.
- Zonares, Ioannes. *Ἐπιτομή ἱστοριῶν*. L. Dindorf, ed. Vol. 4. Leipzig, 1871.

II. Secondary Sources

- Академия Наук СССР. Институт Истории. Академику Борису Дмитриевичу Грекову ко дню семидесятилетия. *Сборник статей*. Moscow, 1952.
- Aleksandrov, A.A. *Во времена княгини Ольги. Легенды и были о княгине Ольге в Псковской земле*. Pskov, 2001.
- Aleksandrov, M.M. *Русские земли-княжества IX-XV веков: компаративистский анализ культурно-политических альтернатив*. Российский Научно-Исследовательский Институт Природного и Культурного Наследия имени Д. С. Лихачева. Moscow, 2009.
- Anderson, B.W. *Understanding the Old Testament*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2007.
- Arne, T.S. *La Suède et l'orient. Etudes archéologiques sur les relations de la Suède et de l'orient pendant l'âge des Vikings*. Uppsala, 1914.
- Artamonov, M.I. *История Хазар*. Leningrad, 1962; 2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 2002.
- . *Очерки древнейшей истории Хазар*. Leningrad, 1936.
- Azbelev, S.N. “Гостомысл.” In *Варяго-русский вопрос в историографии*. Ed. V.V. Fomin. Moscow, 2010. Pp. 598–618.
- Backus, O.P., III. “Legal Analysis and the History of Early Russian Law.” *ASEER* 31 (1972). Pp. 283–290.
- Barsov, T. *Константинопольскій патріархъ и его власть надъ русскою церковію*. St. Petersburg, 1878.

- Beliaev, S.A. "Поход князя Владимира на Корсунь." *ВВ* 51 (1990). Pp. 153–164.
- Benedikz, B.S. "The Evolution of the Varangian Regiment in the Byzantine Army." *BZ* 62 (1969). Pp. 20–24.
- Berezhkov, N.G. *Хронология русского летописания*. Moscow, 1963.
- Bestuzhev-Riumin, K.N. "О составѣ русскихъ лѣтописей до конца XIV вѣка." *ЛЗАК* 4/1 (1868). Pp. 1–157.
- Bibikov, M.V. *Byzantinorossica. Свод византийскихъ свидетельствъ о Руси*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 2004.
- Biener, F.A. *Geschichte der Novellen Justinians*. Berlin, 1824; repr. Aalen, 1970.
- Birnbaum, H. "Jaroslav's Varangian Connection." *S-S* 24 (1978). Pp. 5–25.
- Boba, I. *Moravia's History Reconsidered: A Reinterpretation of Medieval Sources*. The Hague, 1971.
- . *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs: Eastern Europe in the Ninth Century*. The Hague and Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Bogdanova, N.M. "О времени взятия Херсона князем Владимиром." *ВВ* 47 (1986). Pp. 39–46.
- Braun, F. "Das historische Russland im Nordischen Schrifttum des X.–XIV. Jahrhunderts." In *Festschrift Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag 19. Juli 1924*. Halle, 1924. Pp. 150–196.
- Brøndsted, J. *The Vikings*. Baltimore, 1965.
- Brutzkus, J.D. "The Khazar Origin of Ancient Kiev." *SEER* 22 (1944). Pp. 108–124.
- Budovnits, I.U. *Общественно-политическая мысль древней руси (XI–XIV вв.)*. Moscow, 1960.
- Bugoslavsky, S.A. "Къ вопросы о характере и объеме литературной дѣятельности преподобного Нестора." *ИОРЯС* 19 (1914). Book 1, pp. 131–186; and Book 3, pp. 153–191.
- . "Повесть временных лет (Списки, редакции, первоначальный текст)." In *Старинная русская повесть. Статьи и исследования*. Ed. N.K. Gudzy. Moscow and Leningrad, 1941. Pp. 7–37.
- Bury, J.B. *The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire: Creighton Memorial Lecture Delivered at University College, London, 12 November, 1909*. Cambridge, 1910.
- Butler, F. *Enlightener of Rus': The Image of Vladimir Sviatoslavich across the Centuries*. Bloomington, IN, 2002.
- Chadwick, Nora K. *The Beginnings of Russian History: An Enquiry into Sources*. Cambridge, 1946.
- Charanis, P. "Coronation and Its Constitutional Significance in the Later Roman Empire." *Вуз* 15 (1940–1941). Pp. 49–66.
- Cherepnin, L.V. *Русская историография до XIX века*. Moscow, 1957.
- Chupin, G.T. *Предистория и история Киевской Руси, Украины и Крыма*. Kharkov, 2010.
- . *Русь и религия*. Kharkov, 2011.
- Cross, S.H. "Jaroslav the Wise in Norse Tradition." *Sp* 4 (1929). Pp. 177–197.
- . "Primitive Civilization of the Eastern Slavs." *ASEER* 5 (1946). Pp. 51–87.
- . "La tradition islandaise de Saint Vladimir." *RES* 11 (1931). Pp. 133–148.
- Danilevsky, I.N. "Библия и Повесть Временных Лет (К проблеме интерпретации летописных текстов)." *ОИ* 1 (1993). Pp. 78–94.
- . *Древняя Русь глазами современников (IX–XII вв.)*. Moscow, 1999.

- . *Древняя Русь глазами современников и потомков (IX–XII вв.). Курс лекций*. Moscow, 1998.
- . *Повесть Временных Лет: Герменевтические основы историковедения текстов*. Moscow, 2004.
- Davids, A., ed. *The Empress Theophano: Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millenium*. Cambridge, 1995.
- Davidson, H.R.E. *The Viking Road to Byzantium*. London, 1976.
- De Baumgarten, N. *Aux Origines de la Russie*. OCA 119. Rome, 1939.
- . *Olaf Tryggwison roi de Norvège et ses relations avec Saint Vladimir de Russie*. OC 24/1. Rome, 1931.
- . *Saint Vladimir et la conversion de la Russie*. OCA 79. Rome, 1932.
- Dekan, J. *Moravia Magna. The Great Moravian Empire, Its Art and Times*. Bratislava, 1980.
- Demidenko, G.G. *Великий князь Руси Ярослав Мудрый, Научно-популярный очерк*. Kharkov, 2011.
- Demin, V.N. *Русь летописная*. Moscow, 2002.
- D'iakonov, M.A. *Очерки общественного и государственного строя Древней Руси*. 4th ed., rev. and enl. Moscow, 1926.
- Dimnik, M. "The Nature of Princely Rule in Novgorod from 970 to 1136." *MS* 72 (2010). Pp. 125–159.
- . "The 'Testament' of Iaroslav 'the Wise': A Re-Examination." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 29 (1987). Pp. 369–386.
- Dittrich, Z.R. *Christianity in Great Moravia*. Gröningen, 1962.
- Dmitriev, R.P. *Библиография русского летописания*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1962.
- Dölger, F. "Die Kaiserurkunden der Byzantiner als Ausdruck ihrer politischen Anschauungen." *HZ* 159 (1938–1939). Pp. 229–250.
- Dunlop, D.M. *The History of the Jewish Khazars*. Princeton, 1954.
- Dvornik, F. "Byzantine Political Ideas in Kievan Russia." *DOP* 9 and 10 (1956). Pp. 73–121.
- . "Constantinople and Rome." In *The Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4. Cambridge, 1966. Pp. 431–472.
- . *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*. DOS 9. 2 vols. Washington, 1966.
- . *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*. Bs, Supplementa 1. Prague, 1933.
- . *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*. London, 1949.
- . *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*. Cambridge, 1948.
- . *Les Slavs, Byzance et Rome au IX^e siècle*. Paris, 1926.
- . *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization*. Boston, 1956.
- Fedotov, G. "Le baptême de Saint Vladimir et la conversion de la Russie." *Irénikon* 15 (1938). Pp. 417–435.
- . *The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity, the Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, 1946.
- . *Святые древней Руси. (X–XVII ст.)*. 2nd ed. Paris, 1959.
- Featherstone, M. "Olga's Visit to Constantinople in *De Cerimoniis*." *REB* 61 (2003). Pp. 241–251.
- Filaret, Archbishop of Chernigov. *Исторія русской церкви*. 5th ed. St. Petersburg, 1894.

- Florinsky, M.T. *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*. Vol. 1. New York, 1953.
- Fögen, Marie Theres. "Codex Justinianus." *ODB* 1. New York and Oxford, 1991. Pp. 474–475.
- . "Digest." *ODB* 1. New York and Oxford, 1991. P. 623.
- . "Novels of Justinian I." *ODB* 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. Pp. 1497–1498.
- Fomin, V.V., ed. *Варяго-Русский ворнос в историографии*. Moscow, 2010.
- Franklin, S. "Kievan Rus' (1015–1125)." In *CHR*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, 2006. Pp. 73–97.
- . *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*. Cambridge, MA, 1991.
- , and J. Shepard. *The Emergence of Rus, 750–1200*. London and New York, 1996.
- Galkina, Elena S. *Тайны русского каганата*. Moscow, 2002.
- , and A.P. Kuz'min. "Русский каганат и остров русов." In *Славяне и Русь: Проблемы и идеи*. Moscow, 1998. Pp. 464–485.
- Garcia de la Puente, I. "The Indo-European Heritage in the *Povest' Vrennykh Let*." In *Culture and Identity in Eastern Christian History. Papers from the First Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture (ASEC), Inc., October 21–22, 2005 at The Ohio State University*. R.E. Martin and Jennifer B. Spock, eds. Ohio Slavic Papers 9/Eastern Christian Studies 1. Columbus, 2009. Pp. 49–62.
- Gedeonov, S. *Варяги и Русь. Историческое изльдование*. 2 parts. St. Petersburg, 1876.
- Gimbutas, Marija. "Ancient Slavic Religion: A Synopsis." In *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essay on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday 11 October 1966*. Vol. 1. The Hague, 1967. Pp. 738–759.
- . *The Slavs*. New York and Washington, 1971.
- Gimon, T.V., and A.A. Ginnius. "Русское летописанию в свете типологических параллелей (к постановке проблемы)." In *Жанри в письменной культуре Средневековья*. Moscow, 2005. Pp. 174–200.
- Golb, N., and O. Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*. Ithaca and London, 1982; trans. into Russian by V.Ia. Petrukhina, *Хазарско-Еврейские документы X века*. Moscow, 1997.
- Golden, P.B., H. Ben-Shammai, and A. Róna-Tas, eds. *The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium Hosted by the Ben Zvi Institute*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 17. Leiden and Boston, 2007.
- Golubinsky, E.E. *История русской церкви*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Moscow, 1901.
- Gordiyenko, D. "The Mission of Kyivan Princess Ol'ga to the King Otto I in the Context of Rus' and Germany[:] Foreign Policies." *Bs* 66 (2008). Pp. 107–118.
- Gorlin, M. "La chronique de Joachim." *RES* 19 (1939). Pp. 40–51.
- Granberg, J. *Veche in the Chronicles of Medieval Rus: A Study of Functions and Terminology*. Dissertations from the Department of History, Göteborg University 39. Göteborg, 2004.
- Grekov, B.D. *Киевская Русь*. Moscow, 1949.
- . *Крестьяне на Руси с древнейших времен до XVII века*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1946.
- . "На заре русского государства." *ИЖ* 7 (1942). Pp. 14–31.
- . "Несколько замечаний о древнерусском вече." *УЗЛУГУ*, серия исторических наук 4, 19 (1938). Pp. 146–162.

- . “Повесть Временных Лет о походе Владимира на Корсун.” *Изв-ТОИАЕ* 3 (60) (1929). Pp. 99–112.
- Gressmann, H. *Israels Spruchweisheit im Zusammenhang der Weltliteratur, Kunst und Altertum im Lichte neuer Forschung*. Vol. 6. Berlin, 1925.
- Grousset, R. *L'Empire des steppes*. Paris, 1939.
- Gumilev, L.N. *Древняя Русь и великая степь*. Moscow, 1992.
- Gurevich, A.N. *История и сага*. Moscow, 1972.
- Hammer, D.P. “The Character of the *Russkaia Pravda*.” *ASEER* 31 (1972). Pp. 291–295.
- Halperin, C.J. “The Concept of the Russian Land from the Ninth to the Fourteenth Centuries.” *Russian History/Histoire russe* 2 (1975). Pp. 29–38.
- . “Text and Textology: Salmina’s Dating of the Chronicle Tales about Dmitrii Donskoi.” *SEER* 79 (2001). Pp. 248–263.
- , and Ann M. Kleimola. “Visual Evidence of the Cult of St. Vladimir.” *Die Welt der Slaven* 51 (2006). Pp. 253–274.
- Hanak, W.K. “*Bucharest ms. No. 1385 and The Tale of Constantinople 1453: Some Reconsiderations*.” *Bs* 69 (2011). Pp. 267–310.
- . “The Great Moravian Empire: An Argument for a Northern Location.” *MHB* 4 (1995). Pp. 7–24.
- . “The Infamous Svjatoslav: Master of Duplicity in War and Peace.” In *Peace and War: Essays in Honor of George T. Dennis, S.J.* T.S. Miller and J. Nesbitt, eds. Washington, DC, 1995. Pp. 138–151.
- . “New Introduction.” In *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471*. Repr., Hattiesburg, 1970. Pp. xlv–lxi.
- . *The Origin of Kievan Rus’*. Forthcoming.
- . “Photios and the Slavs, 855–867.” In *Acts. XVIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Selected Papers: Main and Communications*. Moscow, 1991. Eds. I. Ševčenko, G.G. Litavrin, and W.K. Hanak. Vol. 1. Shepherdstown, 1996. Pp. 248–258.
- . “Vladimir I: The New Solomon.” *Византинороссика 3: Origins and Outcomes: Byzantine Heritage in Rus’. For Professor Ihor Medvedev, the Corresponding Member of the RAS on his 70th birthday/Истоки и последствия: Византийское наследие на Руси. Сборник статей к 70-летию члена-корреспондента РАЧ И. П. Медведева*, 3 (2005). Pp. 102–115.
- Hellmann, M. “Vladimir der Heiligen in der zeitgenössischen abendländischen Ueberlieferung.” *JGO* 7 (1934). Pp. 403–405.
- Hrushevsky, M. *History of Ukraine-Rus’*. Vol. 1: *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*. Trans. Marta Skorupsky. Edmonton-Toronto, 1997.
- Hussey, Jane M. “The Later Macedonians, the Comneni and the Angeli 1025–1204.” In *The Cambridge Medieval Hisotry*. Vol. 4/1. Cambridge, 1966. Pp. 193–249.
- Ianin, V.L. *Актовые печати древней Руси X–XV вв.* Vol. 1: *Печати X-начала XIII в.* Moscow, 1970.
- Ikonnikov, V. *Опыт изслѣдованія о культуромъ значеніи византии въ русской исторіи*. Kiev, 1869; repr., The Hague, 1970.
- П’ин, N.N. *Летописная статья 6523 года и ее источник. (Опыт анализа)*. Moscow, 1957.
- Plovaisky, D.I. *Исторія Россіи*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1876.

- Istrin, V.M. "Замечания о начале русского летописания. По поводу исследования А. А. Шахматова в области древнерусской летописи." *ИОРЯС* 26 (1923). Pp. 45–102.
- Iushkov, S.V. "К вопросы о дофеодальном ('Варваском') государстве." *ВИ* 7 (1946). Pp. 45–65.
- . *Общественно-политический строй и право киевского государства. Курс истории государства и права СССР*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1949.
- . "Русская Правда как кодекс русского феодального права." *ПСП* 4–5 (1939). Pp. 72–89.
- Jakobson, R. "Slavic Mythology." In *Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend*. Ed. Maria Leach. Vol. 2. New York, 1950. Pp. 1025–1028.
- Jones, G. *A History of the Vikings*. New York and Toronto, 1968.
- Karatay, O. "Karadeniz'de İlk Ruslar ve Şarkel'in İnşası." *Belleten Dört Ayda Bir Çıkar* 74/269 (2010). Pp. 71–111.
- Kartashev, A.V. *Очерки по истории русское церкви*. Vol. 1. Paris, 1959.
- Kawerau, P. *Arabische Quellen zur Christianisierung Rußlands*. Osteuropastudien der Hochschulen des Landes Hessen Reihe II. Band 7. Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Kazhdan, A. "Attaleiates, Michael." *ODB* 1. New York and Oxford, 1991. P. 229.
- . "Phokas." *ODB* 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. Pp. 1665–1666.
- . "Zonaras, John." *ODB* 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. P. 2229.
- Keenan, E.L., "Вече." *Russian History/Histoire russe* 34 (2007). Pp. 83–99.
- Kendrick, T.D. *A History of the Vikings*. New York, 1930.
- Kern, F. *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages: Studies*. Studies in Mediaeval History 4. Oxford, 1956.
- Khrushchov, I.P. *О древнерусских исторических повестях и сказаниях*. Kiev, 1878.
- Klimov, E.V. *Религиозная реформа великого киевского князя Владимира I и христианизация древней Руси*. Tver', 2010.
- Kliuchevsky, V.O. *Боярская дума древней Руси*. 5th ed., Petrograd, 1919.
- . *Курс русской истории*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1937.
- Koch, H. "Byzanz, Ochrid und Kiev 987–1037. Zur Wiederkehr des angeblichen Taufjahres (988–1938)." *Kyrios* 3 (1938). Pp. 253–292.
- Kokovtsov, P.K. *Еврейско-хазарская переписка в X веке*. Leningrad, 1932.
- Kollmann, Nancy S. "Collateral Succession in Kievan Rus'." *HUS* 14 (1990). Pp. 377–385.
- Korpela, J. *Prince, Saint and Apostle: Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavič of Kiev, His Posthumous Life, and the Religious Legitimization of the Russian Great Power*. Veröffentlichungen de Osteuropa-Institut München. Reihe Geschichte 67. Wiesbaden, 2001.
- Kotlar, N.F. *Древняя Русь и Киев в летописных преданиях и легендах*. Kiev, 1986.
- Kovalevsky, M. *Russian Political Institutions: The Growth and Development of These Institutions from the Beginnings of Russian History to the Present Time*. Chicago, 1902.
- Kowalenko, W., G. Labuda, T. Lehr-Splawiński, et al., eds. *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich. Encyklopedyczny zarys kultury słowian od czasów najdawniejszych*. Vols. 1, 3, and 4. Warsaw, 1961–1970.

- Krug, P. *Forschungen in der älteren Geschichte Russlands*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1848.
- Krumbacher, K. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur (527–1453)*. 2 vols. 2nd ed., Munich, 1897.
- Kucherov, S. "Indigenous and Foreign Influences on the Early Russian Legal Heritage." *ASEER* 31 (1972). Pp. 257–282.
- Kunik, E. *Die Berufung der schwedischen Rotsden durch die Finnen und Slawen. Eine Vorarbeit zur Entstehungsgeschichte des russischen Staates*. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg, 1845.
- Kuz'min, A.G. *Начальные этапы древнерусского летописания*. Moscow, 1977.
- Laehr, G. *Die Anfänge des russischen Reiches. Politische Geschichte im 9. u. 10. Jahrhunderts*. HS, heft 189. Berlin, 1930.
- Laurent, V. "Aux Origines de l'Église Russe. L'établissement de la Hiérarchie byzantine." *EO* 38 (1939). Pp. 279–295.
- Lebedev, V., and V. Panov, eds. and trans. *Древнерусские летописи. Перевод и комментарий*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1936.
- Lenhoff, Gail, and Ann Kleimola, eds. *The Book of Royal Degrees and the Genesis of Russian Historical Consciousness*. UCLA Slavic Studies, n.s., 7. Bloomington, IN, 2011.
- Letiche, J.M., ed. *A History of Russian Economic Thought: Ninth through Eighteenth Centuries*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964.
- Levchenko, M.V. *Очерки по истории русско-византийских отношений*. Moscow, 1956.
- Lewicki, T. *Źródła arabskie do dziejów słowiańszczyzny*. Vol. 1. Wrocław and Crakow, 1956.
- Likhachev, D.S. "Культура Киевской Руси при Ярославе Мудром." *ИЖ* 7 (1943). Pp. 28–35.
- . *Русские летописи и их культурно-историческое значение*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1947.
- Likhachev, N.P. "Материалы для истории византийской и русской сфрагистики." Part 1 in *ТМп*. Vol. 1. Leningrad, 1928.
- Linnichenko, I.A. *Въче въ кievской области*. Kiev, 1881.
- Lipshits, E.E. "О походе Руси на Византию ранее 842 года." *ИЗ* 26 (1948). Pp. 312–331.
- Litavrin, G.G. "Пселл о причинах после днего похода русских на Константинополь в 1043 г." *ВВ* 27 (1967). Pp. 71–86.
- . "Путешествие русской княгини Ольги в Константинополь. Проблема источников." *ВВ* 42 (1981). Pp. 35–48.
- . "Война Руси против Византии в 1043 г." In *Исследования по истории Славянских и Балканских народов. Эпоха средневековья. Киевская Русь и ее Славянские соседи*. Ed. V.D. Koroliuk, et al. Moscow, 1972.
- Lowmiański, H. *Zagadnienie roli Normanów w genezie państw słowiańskich*. Warsaw, 1957.
- Lunt, H.G. "Повѣсть врѣменныхъ лѣтъ? or Повѣсть врѣмень и лѣтъ?" *Palaeoslavica* 5 (1997). Pp. 317–326.
- Macartney, C.A. *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*. Cambridge, 1930; repr. 1968.
- McCormick, M., and A. Kazhdan. "Basileus." In *ODB*. Vol. 1. New York and Oxford, 1991. P. 162.

- Macůrek, J. *Dějepisectví evropského východu*. Prague, 1946.
- Makarii, Metropolitan of Moscow. *Исторія Христіанства въ Россіи до равноапостольнаго Князя Владимира, какъ въвъденіе въ исторію русской церкви*. 2nd ed., rev., St. Petersburg, 1868.
- . *Исторія русской церкви*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed., rev., St. Petersburg, 1868.
- Maniscalco-Basile, G. "The Christian Prince through the Mirror of Rus' Chronicles." *Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millenium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine*. Eds. O. Pritsak and I. Ševčenko. HUS 12/13. Cambridge, MA, 1988–1989. Pp. 672–688.
- Marquart, J. *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*. Leipzig, 1903.
- Mel'nikova, Elena A., ed. *Древняя Русь в свете зарубежных источников. Учебное пособие*. Moscow, 1999.
- Millard, M. "Sons of Vladimir, Brothers of Iaroslav." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 12 (1971). Pp. 286–295.
- Miller, G.F. "О первомъ лѣтописателе россискомъ. Преподобномъ Несторе, о его лѣтиписи и о продолжателяхъ." *ЕС* (April, 1755). Pp. 299–324.
- Milov, L.V. *Исследования по истории памятников средневекового права*. Moscow, 2009.
- Mitrovits, T. *Nomokanon der slavischen Morgenländischen Kirche oder der Kormtschaja Kniga*. Vienna and Leipzig, 1898.
- Moravcsik, Gy. *Byzantinoturcica*. 2 vols. Berliner byzantinistische Arbeiten, Bd. 10–11. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1958.
- Moshin, V.A. "Варяго-русский вопрос." *С* 10 (1931). Pp. 109–136, 343–379, and 501–587. Repr. in V.V. Fomin, ed. *Варяго-русский вопрос в историографии*. Moscow, 2010. Pp. 11–102.
- Musin, A.E. *Христианизация новгородской земли в IX–XIV веках. Погребальный обряд и христианские древности*. St. Petersburg, 2002.
- Nazarenko, A.V. *Древняя Русь на международных путях. Междисциплинарные очерки культурных, торговых, политических связей IX–XII веков*. Moscow, 2001.
- Nikol'sky, N.K. *Материалы для повременнаго списка русскихъ писателей и ихъ сочиненіи (X–XI вв.)*. St. Petersburg, 1906.
- . *Повесть временных лет как источник для истории начального русской письменности и культуры. К вопросу о древнейшем русском летописании*. Vol. 1. Leningrad, 1930.
- Nordeide, Saebjorg W. *The Viking Age as a Period of Religious Transformation: The Christianization of Norway from AD 560–1150/1200*. Studies in Viking and Medieval Scandinavia 2. Turnhout, 2011.
- Novosel'tsev, A.P. *Об управлении империей*. Moscow, 1989.
- , et al. *Древнерусское государство и его международное значение*. Moscow, 1965.
- Nowak, F. *Medieval Slavdom and the Rise of Russia*. The Berkshire Studies in European History. New York, 1930.
- Obolensky, D. *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500–1453*. New York and Washington, 1971; repr. London, 2000.
- . "The Byzantine Sources on the Scandinavians in Eastern Europe." *S-S, Supplementum* 1: *Varangian Problems*. Copenhagen, 1970. Pp. 149–169.

- . “Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations.” *DOP* 11 (1957). Pp. 23–78.
- . “The Empire and Its Northern Neighbors, 565–1018.” In *The Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 4/1. Cambridge, 1966. Pp. 473–518.
- . “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy.” *Actes du XII^e Congrès international d’Etudes byzantines. Ochride 10–16 Septembre 1961*. Vol. 1. Belgrad, 1963. Pp. 45–61; and “Responses” of Gy. Moravcsik and D.A. Zakythinis, pp. 301–319.
- . “Russia’s Byzantine Heritage.” *OSP* 1 (1950). Pp. 37–63.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament: In the Light of the Newly Discovered ‘Teachings of Amen-em-ope.’* London and New York, 1927.
- . *The Wisdom of Solomon, Translations of Early Documents*. Second Series. Hellenistic-Jewish Texts 1. London and New York, 1917.
- Oikonomides, N. “Persthlavitzza, the Little Preslav.” *Sudöst-Forschungen* 42 (1983). Pp. 1–9.
- Ostrogorsky, G. “Автократор и Самодржац.” *СКА* 164 (1935). Pp. 97–121.
- . “The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order.” *SEER* 35, no. 84 (1956). Pp. 1–14.
- . *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick, 1957; repr. Oxford, 1963; Oxford, 1980.
- . “Отношение церкви и государстве в Византии.” *СК* 4 (1931). Pp. 121–134.
- . *Сабрана дела Георгија Острогорског*. Vols. 4 and 5. Belgrade, 1970.
- . “Владимир Святой и Византия.” In *Владимирский Сборник в память 950-летия крещения Руси, 988–1938*. Belgrade, 1938. Pp. 31–40. Repr. in Serbian: “Кијевски кнез 950-летия крещения Руси.” In *idem, Византия и Словени, Сабрана дела Георгија Острогорског*. Vol. 4. Belgrade, 1970. Pp. 137–146.
- Ostrowski, D. “The Account of Volodimer’s Conversion in the *Povest’ vremennykh let*: A Chiasmus of Stories.” *HUS* 28, nos. 1–4 (2006). Pp. 567–580.
- . “Identifying Psalmic Quotations in the *Povest’ Vremennykh Let*.” In *Culture and Identity in Eastern Christian History. Papers from the First Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture (ASEC), Inc., October 21–22, 2005 at The Ohio State University*. Eds. R.E. Martin and Jennifer B. Spock. Ohio Slavic Papers 9/Eastern Christian Studies 1. Columbus, 2009. Pp. 217–250.
- Papadakis, A. “Trullo, Council in.” *ODB* 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. Pp. 2126–2127.
- Parkhomenko, V.A. “Характер и значение эпохи Владимира, принявшего христианство.” *УЗЛУГ* 73, серия исторических наук, вып. 8 (1941). Pp. 203–214.
- . “Киевская Русь и Хазария.” *С* 6 (1927). Pp. 380–387.
- . “Русь и Печенеги.” *С* 8 (1929). Pp. 138–144.
- . *У истохов русской государственности (VIII–XI вв.)*. Leningrad, 1924.
- Pashuto, V.T. *Внешняя политика Древней Руси*. Moscow, 1968.
- Paszkwicz, H. *The Making of the Russian Nation*. London, 1963.
- . *The Origin of Russia*. London, 1954.
- Persowski, F. *Studia nad pograniczem Polsko-Ruskim w X–XI wieku*. Wrocław, Warsaw and Cracow, 1962.
- Petrov, N.I. “Древние изображения святого Владимира.” In *ТКДА* (July–August, 1915). Pp. 348–349.

- Philipp, W. *Ansätze geschichtlichen und politischen Denken im Kiewer Russland*. JGO, supplement 3. Breslau, 1940.
- Plokhly, S. *The Origins of Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Cambridge, 2006.
- Podskalsky, G. *Christentum und Theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237)*. Munich, 1982.
- Pogodin, M. *Несторъ, историческо-критическое разсуждение о начале русскихъ летописей*. Moscow, 1839.
- . *Норманскій періодъ русской исторіи*. Moscow 1859.
- Pokrovsky, S. "Салическая правда и ее сходство с русской правдой." *СГ* 5 (1936). Pp. 105–114.
- Poppe, A. *Christian Russia in the Making*. Variorum Collected Studies Series 867. Aldershot, 2007.
- . "La dernière expedition russe contre Constantinople." *Bs* 32 (1971). Pp. 1–29.
- . "Feofana Novgorodskaia." *Новгородский Исторический Сборник* 6 (1997). Pp. 102–120.
- . "How the Conversion of Rus' Was Understood in the Eleventh Century." *HUS* 11 (1987). Pp. 287–302.
- . "Der Kampf um die Kiewer Thronfolge nach dem 15. Juli 1015." *Forschungen zur europäischen Geschichte* 50 (1995). Pp. 275–296.
- . "Once again Concerning the Baptism of Olga, Archontissa of Rus'." *DOP* 46 (1992). Pp. 271–277.
- . *Państwo i kościół na Rusi w XI wieku*. Warsaw, 1968.
- . "The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus. Byzantine-Russian Relations between 986–989." *DOP* 30 (1976). Pp. 195–244.
- . "О Причинах похода Владимира Святославича на Корсунь." *Вестник МГУ. Серия 8: История* 2 (1978). Pp. 45–58.
- . "Rus' i Byzancjum w Latach 986–989." *Kwartalnik historyczny* 85/1 (1978). Pp. 3–23.
- . "Русские митрополии константинопольской патриархии в XI столетии." *ВВ* 28 (1968). Pp. 85–108.
- . "St. Vladimir as a Christian." In *The Legacy of St. Vladimir: Byzantium, Russia, America. Papers Presented at a Symposium Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, Crestwood, NY, September 27–October 1, 1988*. J. Breck, J. Meyendorff, and E. Silk, eds. Crestwood, 1990. Pp. 41–46.
- . "Theophana von Novgorod." *Bs* 58 (1997). Pp. 131–158.
- . "Words that Serve the Authority: On the Title of 'Grand Prince' in Kievan Rus'." *APH* 60 (1989). Pp. 159–184.
- Poulik, J., and B. Chropovsky. *Grossmähren und die Anfänge der tschechoslowakischen Staatlichkeit*. Prague, 1986.
- Preobrazhensky, A.G. *Этимологический словарь Русского языка*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1959.
- Presniakov, A.E. "Древнерусское летописание." In *Исторія русской литературы до XIX в.* A.E. Gruzinsky, ed. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1916. Pp. 148–169.
- . *Княжое право въ древней Руси. Очерки по исторіи X–XII столѣтій*. ЗИ-ФФИСПУ, part 90. St. Petersburg, 1909.
- . *Лекции по русской исторіи*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1938.

- Priselkov, M.D. *История русского летописания XI-XV вв.* Leningrad, 1940.
- . “Лаврентьевская летопись (история текста).” *УЗЛУ* 32, серия исторических наук 2 (1939). Pp. 76–142.
- . *Нестор-летописец. Опыт историко-литературной характеристики.* Petrograd, 1923.
- . *Очерки по церковно-политической истории Киевской Руси X-XII вв.* St. Petersburg, 1913.
- . “Русско-Византийские отношения IX-XII вв.” *ВДИ* 3 (1939). Pp. 98–109.
- Procházka, Vl. “Le Zakopň Sudnujъ ljudemъ et la Grande Moravie.” *Bs* 29 (1969). Pp. 112–150.
- Pushkarev, S.G. *Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917.* G. Vernadsky and R.T. Fisher, Jr., eds. New Haven and London, 1970.
- Raffensperger, C. *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World.* Harvard Historical Studies 177. Cambridge, MA, 2012.
- Rankin, O.S. *Israel's Wisdom Literature, Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion: The Kerr Lectures Delivered in Trinity College, Glasgow, 1933–36.* Edinburgh, 1936; repr. 1954.
- Reiter, N. “Mythologie der alten Slaven.” In *Wörterbuch der Mythologie.* Ed. H.W. Haussig. Vol. 1. Stuttgart, 1965–. Pp. 164–208.
- Riasanovsky, A.V. “The Embassy of 838 Revisited: Some Comments in Connection with a ‘Normanist’ Source on Early Russian History.” *JGO* 10 (1962). Pp. 1–12.
- . “The Varangian Question.” In *I Normanni e la loro espansione in Europa nell'alto medioevo. 18–24 aprile 1968.* Spoleto, 1969. Pp. 171–204 and 553–569.
- Romanov, V.A. *Люди и нравы древней Руси (Историко-бытовые очерки XI-XIII вв.).* 2nd ed., Moscow-Leningrad, 1966; repr., Moscow, 2002.
- Rubinshtein, N.L. *Русская историография.* [Moscow], 1941.
- Rubakov, V.A. “Русь и Хазария (К исторической географии Хазарии).” In Академия Наук СССР. Институт Истории. *Академику Борису Дмитриевичу Грекову ко дню семидесятилетия. Сборник статей.* Moscow, 1952. Pp. 76–88.
- Rydzevskaia, Elena A. *Древняя Русь и Скандинавия в IX-XIV вв. (девятнадцатом веке): Материалы и исследования.* Moscow, 1978.
- Saturník, T. *Příspěvky k šíření byzantského práva u Slovanů.* RČAV 1, 64. Prague, 1922.
- Schechter, S. “An Unknown Khazar Document.” *JQR* 3 (1912). Pp. 181–219.
- Scherer, J.B. *Des heiligen Nestors und der Fortsetzer desselben älteste Jahrbücher der Russischen Geschichte vom Jahre 858 bis zum Jahre 1203.* Leipzig, 1774.
- Schminck, A. “Epanagoge.” *ODB* 1. New York and Oxford, 1991. Pp. 703–704.
- . “Nomokanon of Fourteenth Titles.” *ODB* 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. P. 1491.
- . “Nomokanones.” *ODB* 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. P. 1491.
- Schlözer, A.L. *Nestor. Russische Annalen in ihrer slawonischen Grundsprache.* Vol. 1. Göttingen, 1802.
- Semenovker, V.A. *Библиографические памятники Византии.* Moscow, 1995.
- Senkovsky, V. *Собрание сочинений Сенковского (Барона Брамбеуса).* Vol. 5. St. Petersburg, 1858–1859.
- Serebriansky, N. *Древнерусскія княжескія житія. (Обзор редакції и текстъ).* Vol. 2. Moscow, 1915.
- Sergeevich, V.I. *Древности русского права.* Vol. 2: *Въче и князь.* 3rd ed. St. Petersburg, 1909.

- . *Лекції и изслѣдованія по древней исторіи русскаго права*. 4th ed. St. Petersburg, 1910; repr., The Hague, 1967.
- Shaikin, A.A. *Повесть временных лет: История и поэтика*. Moscow, 2011.
- Shakhmatov, A.A. “Несторъ-лѣтописецъ.” *ЗНТШ* 117–118 (1914). Pp. 31–53.
- . *Обозрение русских летописных сводов XIV–XVI вв.* Moscow and Leningrad, 1938.
- . “Повесть временных летъ и ея источники.” *ТОДрЛ* 4 (1940). Pp. 9–150.
- . *Разысканія о древнейшихъ русскихъ лѣтописныхъ сводахъ*. St. Petersburg, 1908.
- Shchapov, Ia. N. *Древнерусские княжеские уставы XI–XV вв.* Moscow, 1976.
- . *Княжеские уставы и церковъ в древней Руси XI–XIV вв.* Moscow, 1972.
- . *Государство и церковъ древней Руси. X–XIII вв.* Moscow, 1989.
- . “Устав князя Ярослава и вопрос об отношении к византискому наследію на Руси в середина XI в.” *ВВ* 31 (1971). Pp. 71–78.
- . *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследіе на Руси в XI–XIII вв.* Moscow, 1978.
- Shchhavelev, S.P. “Славянская дань Хазарии: Новые материалы к интерпретации.” *ВИ* 10 (2003).
- Shekera, I.M. *Кийська Русь XI ст. у міжнародних видносинах*. Kiev, 1967.
- Shelamanov, N.B. “Предварительный список славяно-русских рукописей XI–XIV вв., хранящихся в СССР.” *Археографический ежегодник за 1965 год*. Moscow, 1966. Pp. 177–272.
- Shepard, J. “Byzantium and Russia in the Eleventh Century: A Study in Political and Ecclesiastical Relations.” Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oxford, 1973.
- . *Emergent Elites and Byzantium in the Balkans and East-Central Europe*. Variorum Collected Studies Series 953. Farnham, 2011.
- . “The Origins of Rus’ (c. 900–1015).” In *The Cambridge History of Russia*. Vol. 1: *From Early Rus’ to 1689*. Ed. Maureen Perrie. Cambridge, 2006. Pp. 47–97.
- . “Otto III, Boleslaw Chroby and the ‘Happening’ at Gniezno, A.D. 1000: Some Possible Implications of Professor Poppe’s Thesis Concerning the Offspring of Anna Porphyrogenita.” *Byzantina et Slavica Cracoviensia* 3: *Byzantium and East Central Europe*. Eds. G. Prinzing, M. Salamon, and P. Stephenson. Cracow, 2001. Pp. 29–48.
- . “Why Did the Russians Attack Byzantium in 1043?” *B-NJ* 22 (1977–1984). Pp. 147–212.
- , and S. Franklin, eds. *Byzantine Diplomacy: Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March, 1990*. Aldershot, 1992.
- Sherman, I.L. *Русские исторические источники X–XVIII вв.* Kharkov, 1959.
- Ševčenko, I. *Byzantium and the Slavs: In Letters and Culture*. Cambridge, MA, and Naples, 1991.
- . “The Date and Author of the So-Called Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus.” *ДОР* 25 (1971). Pp. 117–188.
- Shostak, M.V. *Основні теорії утворення Кийської Русі в Українознавчих дослідженнях XX–XXI століття*. Kiev, 2011.
- Shusharin, V.P. *Современная буржуазная историография древней Руси*. Moscow, 1964.

- Solov'ev, A.V. "О печати и титуле Владимира святого." *Vs 10* (1948). Pp. 31–44.
- . "‘Reges’ et ‘Regnum Russiae’ au moyen âge." *Вуз* 36 (1966). Pp. 144–173.
- Soloviev, S.M. *Исторія отношеніи между русскими князьями рюрикова дома*. Moscow, 1847.
- . *История России съ древнейших времен*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1959.
- Sotnikova, Marina P. *Древнейшие русские монеты X–XI веков: Каталог и Исследование*. Moscow, 1995.
- , and I.G. Spassky. *Russian Coins of the X–XI Centuries A.D.: Recent Research and a Corpus in Commemoration of the Millenary of the Earliest Russian Coinage*. Trans. of *Тысячелетіе древнейших монет России: Сводный каталог русских монет X–XI веков*, by H. Bartlett Wells. Oxford, 1982.
- . *Тысячелетіе древнейших монет России: Сводный каталог русских монет X–XI веков*. Leningrad, 1983.
- Sreznevsky, I.I. "Обозрѣніе древнихъ русскихъ списковъ Кормчеы Книгы." *СО-РЯС* 65, no. 2, part 2 (1897). Pp. 66–134.
- Stender-Petersen, A. *Die Varägersage als Quellen der altrussischen Chronik*. AJ 6. Copenhagen, 1934.
- Stökl, G. "Der zweite Salamon. Eine Bemerkungen zur Herrschervorstellung im alten Rußland." In *idem, Der russische Staat in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. Wiesbaden, 1981. Pp. 23–31.
- Stratonov, I. "К вопросам о составе и происхождении краткой редакціи Русской Правды." *ИОАИЕКУ* 30, 4 (1920). Pp. 385–424.
- Suvorov, N.S. *Къ вопросу о западномъ влияніи на древне-русское право*. Iaroslavl', 1893.
- . *Следы западно-католическаго церковнаго права въ памятникахъ древняго русскаго права*. Iaroslav, 1888.
- Tabov, Io. *Когда крестилась Киевская Русь?* Серия «Досье Новой Хронологии.» St. Petersburg, 2003.
- Talbot, Alice-Mary. "Gregoras Nikephoros." *ODB*. Vol. 2. New York and Oxford, 1991. Pp. 874–875.
- Tatishchev, V.N. *Исторія російская*. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow and Leningrad, 1962–1963.
- Tikhomirov, M.N. *Древнерусские города*. 2nd ed., rev. and enlarged. Moscow, 1956.
- . *Источниковедение истории СССР*. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1962.
- . *Исторические связи России со славянскими странами и Византией*. Moscow, 1969.
- . *Пособие для изучения Русской Правды*. Moscow, 1953.
- . *Русская Правда*. Moscow, 1939.
- . "Русская Правда. (К 200-летию открытия памятника)." *И-М* 5 (1938). Pp. 138–155.
- , ed. *Хрестоматія по истории СССР. С древнейших времен до конца XV века*. Moscow, 1960.
- Timoshina, L.A. *Источниковедение, История России X–XX вв.: Сборник статей в честь Сергея Николаевича Кистерева*. Moscow, 2008.
- Tolochko, P.P. *Давньоруські літописи і літописці X–XIII ст.* Kiev, 2005.
- . "Летописные известия о похода Святослава на Дунай и их источники." *ВВ* 66 (91) (2007). Pp. 146–154.

- . “Вече и народные движения в Киеве.” In *Исследования по истории славянских и балканских народов. Эпоха средневековья. Киевская Русь и ее славянские соседи*. Ed. V.D. Koroliuk, et al. Moscow, 1972. Pp. 125–143.
- Tolstoi, I.I. *Древнѣйшія русскія монеты великаго княжества Кіевскаго, нумизматическій опытъ*. St. Petersburg, 1882.
- Tortika, A.A. “Киевское письмо’ хазарских евреев: К проблеме критики содержания источника.” *Материалы по археологии, истории и этнографии Таврии* 10 (2002). Pp. 535–542.
- Trapp, E., et al., eds. *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*. Fasc. 1. Vienna, 1994.
- Tret’iakov, P.N. *Восточнославянские племена*. Moscow and Leningrad, 1948.
- Trotsky, I.M. “Элементы дружинной идеологии в ‘Повести Временных Лет.’” *Пи* 17 (1936). Pp. 17–45.
- Tsvetkov, S.V. *Поход Русов на Константинополь в 860 году и начало Руси*. St. Petersburg, 2010.
- Tsyb, S.V. *Древнерусское времяисчисление в «Повести временных лет»*. 2nd ed., amended. St. Petersburg, 2011.
- Ukhanova, Elena V. “Древнерусские рукописи последней четверти XI–XII вв. в хранилищах Львова и Киева: Новые находки и атрибуции.” *Paleoslavica* 19/1 (2011). Pp. 84–117.
- Uspensky, V.A. *Борис и Глеб: Восприятие истории в древней Руси*. Moscow, 2000.
- Vaillant, A. “La chronique de Kiev et son auteur.” *Prilozi* 20, 3–4 (1954). Pp. 114–119.
- Val’denberg, V. *Древнерусскія ученія о предѣлахъ царской власти. Очерки русской политической литературы отъ Владимира Святого до конца XVII вѣка*. Petrograd, 1916; repr., The Hague, 1966.
- Vašica, J. “Origine Cyrillo-Methodienne du plus ancien code slave dit ‘Zakon sudnyj ljudem.’” *Bs* 12 (1951). Pp. 153–174.
- Vasiliev, A.A. *The Goths in the Crimea*. Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America 11. Cambridge, MA, 1936.
- . *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Vol. 1. Madison, 1932.
- . “Justinian’s Digest. In Commemoration of the 1499th Anniversary of the Publication of the Digest (A.D. 533–1933).” *SBN* 5 (1939). Pp. 711–734.
- . *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*. The Medieval Academy of America Pub. No. 46. Cambridge, MA, 1946.
- . “Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium.” *Sp* 7 (1932). Pp. 350–360.
- Vasil’evsky, V.G. *Труды В. Г. Васильевского*. Vols. 1 and 2. St. Petersburg, 1908–1909.
- Vasmer, M. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg, 1950.
- Vernadsky, G. *Kievan Russia*. New Haven, 1948.
- . *The Origins of Russia*. Oxford, 1959.
- . “The Status of the Russian Church during the First Half-Century Following Vladimir’s Conversion.” *SEER* 20 (1941). Pp. 294–314.
- . “Византийскія ученія о власти царя и патриарха.” In *Сборник статей, посвященных памяти Н. П. Кондакова*. Prague, 1926. Pp. 143–154.
- , and M. de Ferdinándy. *Studien zur ungarischen Frühgeschichte*. SA 47. Munich, 1947.
- Vilkul, Tat’iana L. *Люди и князь в древнерусских летописях*. Moscow, 2009.

- Vlasto, A.P. *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs*. Cambridge, 1970.
- Vodolazkin, E.G. *Всемирная история и литературе Древней Руси (На материале хронографического и палеяного повествования XI-XV веков)*. Sagners Slavistische Sammlung 26. Munich, 2000; 2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 2008.
- Von Lilienfeld, F. "Altkirchliche und mittelalterliche Missionstradition und motiv in den Berichten der 'Nestorchronik' über der Taufe Vladimir I. Heiligen." In *Slavistische Studie zum X. internationalen Slavistenkongress in Sofia, 1988*. R. Olesch and H. Rothe, eds. SF 54. Cologne, 1988. Pp. 399–414.
- Vysotsky, S.A. *Древнерусские надписи Софии Киевской XI-XIV вв.* Vol. 1. Kiev, 1966.
- Westberg, F. *Die Fragmente des Toparcha Gothicus (Anonymus Tauricus)*. ЗИАН, series 8, Ист.-Филол., 5, 2. St. Petersburg, 1901; repr. SB 18. Leipzig, 1975.
- Zernack, K. *Die burgstädtischen Volksversammlungen bei den Ost- und Westslaven. Studien zur verfassungsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung des Veče*. Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Zernov, N. "Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church." *SEER* 28 (1949–1950). Pp. 123–138 and 425–438.
- Žužek, P.I. *Kormčaja Kniga: Studies on the Chief Code of Russian Canon Law*. OCA 168. Rome, 1964.
- Zuckerman, C. "Le voyage d'Olga et la première ambassade espagnole à Constantinople en 946." *Travaux et Mémoires* 13 (2000). Pp. 647–672.

INDEX

- Abel, *biblical figure*, 8, 122, 131
- Abimelech, *biblical figure and illegitimate son of Gideon*, 55, 56
- Abraham, *biblical figure*, 65–66
- Abramovich, D.I., *author*, 54
- Absalom, *son of biblical David*, 174
- Abshād, *lesser king*, 139
- Abū-l Hasam Mas'ūdī, *Arab historian*, 140
- Achimaas, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Adalbert, *bishop of Trier*, 25
- Adam, *biblical figure*, 8
- Adam, *bishop of Bremen*, 90, 133
- ἀσελφοὶ μητρῶοι, *uterine brothers*, 37
- ὁ ἀδελφός, *brother*, 37
- Africa, 125
- Ahindab, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Ahmad Ibn-Fadlān, *Arab traveler*, 139
- Академия Наук СССР, Институт Истории, 45, 135
- Aleksandrov, A.A., *author*, 12
- Aleksandrov, M.M., *author*, 68
- Alfred, *king of Wessex*, 117
- Amnon, *son of biblical David*, 152
- Anatolia (Asia Minor), 34
- Anderson, B.W., *author*, 65
- Anglo-Saxon, *court procedure*, 117
- Anna, *purported wife of Jaroslav*, 41
- Anna, *wife of Vladimir I and porphyrogenete princess, daughter of the Byzantine emperor Romanos II*, 33 and *passim*
- Annunciation, *church of Kiev*, 62
- Anti-Normanist, 126
- Arab (-ic), 135, 136
- sources*, 137, 138, 140
- ἄρχον, *governor*, 100, 103
- archontissa, *princess*, 100
- Argob, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Arne, T.S., *author*, 112
- Artamonov, M.I., *author*, 135
- Aruboth, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Aser, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Asia (-n, -tic), 28, 136
- hordes*, 40
- Minor*, 75
- nomadic incursions*, 135
- states*, 147
- Askold, *early Varangian ruler of Kiev*, 19, 20, 121
- Assyrians, 55
- Augustus, *Roman emperor*, 49
- ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ, ἡ αὐταρχος, *autokrator, autocrat*, 71, 72, 73, 77, 80, 85, 86, 87, 101
- Azbelev, S.N., *author*, 128
- Azov, *Sea of*, 136
- Baana, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Backus, O.P., III, *author*, 116, 117
- bāk, *cf. beg*
- Balkan(s), *military campaigns*, 10
- Slavs*, 116
- Baloth, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Bana, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Barbier de Meynard, C., *author*, 140
- Bardas Phokas, *domestik, duke of Chaldia and Kolonei*, 28, 34–35, 85, 86
- Bardas Skleros, *magistros*, 75
- Barker, E., *author*, 73, 79–80, 86
- Barsov, T., *author*, 92
- Bartlett Wells, H., *trans.*, 101
- Bartold, V.V., *author*, 139
- Bartoletti Colombo, Anna Maria, *author*, 85
- Basil, *Kiev, church of saint*, 22, 23
- Basil I, *Byzantine emperor*, 73, 95
- Basil II, *Byzantine emperor*, 28, 33, 34, 35, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 87, 99, 101, 131
- βασιλεύων, *lesser king*, 97, 98
- βασιλεύς, *basileus*, 48, 71, 72, 73, 114, 115, 156
- Bavaria, 133
- beg, *second king of Khazars*, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 147, 151
- Bekker, I., *author*, 10, 25, 91, 103
- Belgorod (Bel'), *Rus' town*, 43, 44, 100, 156, 157
- Beliaev, S.A., *author*, 34
- Beloozero, *town*, 16
- Ben-Shammai, H., *author*, 138
- Benabnadab, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Bendacar, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Benedikz, B.S., *author*, 113, 114, 131
- Beneshevich, V.N., *author*, 80, 82, 83, 84, 89, 98, 169

- Bengaber, *Hebrew governor*, 35
 Benhesed, *Hebrew governor*, 35
 Benhur, *Hebrew governor*, 35
 Benjamin, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
 Benz, E., *author*, 54, 82
 Berestovo, *church at*, 65
 princely estate at, 93
 Bestuzhev-Riumin, K.N., *author*, 3
 Bethanan, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
 Bethsames, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
 Bethsan, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
 Bibikov, M.V., *author*, 25
 Biener, F.A., *author*, 85
 Birnbaum, H., *author*, 4, 68
 Black Sea (Pontus, Pontic), 19, 20, 96
 littoral, 22, 23, 76, 112
 steppe, 82, 151
 Blessed Virgin of the Tithe, *church of*, 43, 81, 83
 Blud, *military commander under Jaropolk*, 12–13, 152–153, 154, 162
 Boba, I., *author*, 94, 135
 Bogdanova, N.M., *author*, 34
 Bohemia, 125
 БОЯРИ (boyars), *social order*, 16, 21, 84, 160, 161
 БОЯРИНА (lesser boyars), 19
 Boleslas, *king of Poland*, 133
 Bolesław Chrobry, *king of Poland*, 33, 53
Books of Chronicles, OT, 29, 31, 43, 56, 57, 58, 59, 122, 130, 167
Books of Kings, OT, 29, 31, 35, 42, 43, 44, 47, 56, 57, 58, 59, 122, 130, 167
 Boris Vladimirovich, *prince*, 33–34 and *passim*
 Braun, F., *author*, 132
 Breck, J., *author*, 27
 Brøndsted, J., *author*, 126
 Brunner, H., *author*, 117
 Bruno of Querfurt, *correspondence of*, 133
 Brutzkus, J.D., *author*, 142
 Budjatin', *Rus' village*, 52
 Budovnits, I.U., *author*, 9, 132
 Bug, *river*, 60
 basin, 60
 Bugoslavsky, S.A., *author*, 3, 54
 Bukovina, *province*, 32
 Bulgar(s, -ia, -ian), xi, 38, 39, 79, 80, 86, 94, 96, 107, 108
 annalsitics, 4
 Balkan people, 9, 32
 lands of Balkan Bulgars, 9
 monks, 96
 an unnamed consort of Vladimir I, 36, 37
 Volga, 23, 24, 25, 32, 74, 145
 wife of Vladimir I, 37, 39, 51
 Bury, J.B., *author*, 71–72
 Butler, F., *author*, 29, 48, 65
 Byzantine(s), xi and *passim*
 annalistics, 2
 artwork, 50
 calendar, 26
 canon laws, 108
 Christianity, passim
 commonwealth, 73
 court style, 117
 emperor(s), passim
 historiography, 7
 lands, 9
 laws, 78, 79, 81
 merchants, 90
 monastic institutions, 62
 patriarch(s), passim
 rite, 23, 81
 rulers, 8 scribes, 8 and *passim*
 sources, 19, 28, 34, 71, 78
 text(s), 8, and *passim*
 trade, 42
 Byzantine-Rus', *conflicts*, 10
 relations, 91
 Byzantium, *passim*
 Caesar, cf., *tsar*
 Cain, *biblical figure*, 8, 122, 131
 Canaan (-ite), 56
 fortress of, 35
 Casimir I, *king of Poland*, 61
 Caspian, *Sea*, 136
 Chacanus, cf. *khagan*
 Chadwick, Nora, *author*, 20, 154
 Charanis, P., *author*, 72
 Cherepnin, L.V., *author*, 4
 Chernigov, *populace of*, 158
 town, 57, 67, 123, 124, 130, 159
 Cherven', *town*, 15, 16, 32
 China, *emperors*, 137
 Christianity, Byzantine, *passim*
 Latin, 8 and *passim*
 Chropovsky, B., *author*, 94
 Chud', *tribe*, 12, 155
 Chupin, G.T., *author*, 6, 9, 11–12, 20
 Collin, H.S., *author*, 114
 Constantine, the Philosopher, cf. Cyril, *saint*

- Constantine I the Great, *Byzantine emperor*, 48, 49, 50, 102, 103
- Constantine V, *Byzantine emperor*, 94
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, *Byzantine emperor*, 11, 25, 73, 77, 78, 79, 144
- De Administrando Imperio*, 77, 144, 151, 152
- De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, 25, 73, 77
- Constantine IX Monomachos, *Byzantine emperor*, 91, 92, 93, 94
- Constantine Psellos, cf. Michael Psellos
- Constantinople, *capital of Byzantine empire*, 9 and *passim*
- Cowan, G., *author*, 26
- Crimea, *peninsula*, 34, 57
- Croatians, White, *tribal group*, 32
- Cross, S.H., *author*, 3, 41, 44, 59–60, 121, 129, 132
- Cyril, *metropolitan*, 98
- Cyril (Constantine the Philosopher), *saint*, 93, 94
- Cyril, *metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'*, 83
- Czech(s), 32, 36, 37, 38, 111
- Danes, 140
- Danilevsky, I.N., *author*, 3, 8, 9, 39, 163
- Danish, 139
- Danube, *river*, 9, 10, 98
- David, *Judeo-Christian name given to Gleb Vladimirovich*, 37
- David, *Hebrew king*, 7, 28, 29, 32, 46, 47, 51, 54, 152, 167
- Davids, A., *author*, 99
- Davidson, H.R. E., *author*, 69
- Dazh'bog, *Kievan Rus' deity*, 22, 23
- de Baumgarten, N., *author*, 27, 28, 112, 131
- de Boor, C., *author*, 8
- de Courteille, P., *author*, 159
- de Ferdinándy, M., *author*, 152
- Dekan, J., *author*, 94
- Demidenko, G.G., *author*, 39, 67, 83
- Demin, V.N., *author*, 2, 20, 128
- Desna, *river*, 44, 57
- Dewey, H.W., *author*, 94
- D'iakonov, M.A., *author*, 82, 116, 150, 157, 161
- Dimnik, M., *author*, 67, 68
- Dindorf, L., *author*, 103
- Diocletian, *Roman emperor*, 103
- Dir, *early Varangian ruler of Kiev*, 19, 20, 121
- Dittrich, Z.R., *author*, 94–95
- Dmitriev, R.P., *author*, 3
- Dnieper, *river*, 10, 18, 42, 57, 143
- basins*, 151
- Dobrynja, *uncle of Vladimir I*, 32
- Dölger, F., *author*, 72, 75, 76
- Don, *river*, 136, 151
- Drevljane, *Eastern Slavic tribe*, 9, 18, 20, 21
- drott, head of kin*, 108, 110, 111, 114, 115, 120, 121, 122, 126, 127
- ДРУЖИНА, retinue*, 31, 35, 58, 67, 160
- Dulebian-Volynian federation, 127
- Duncan, *Scottish claimant to throne*, 125
- Dunlop, D.H., *author*, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 144
- Dvornik, F., *author*, 26, 49, 65, 71–72, 78, 83, 86, 88, 94, 95, 96, 97, 102, 125, 145, 157
- Dzakson, Tat'iana N., *author*, 39
- East Roman Empire, cf. Byzantine
- Eastern Slavs (Slavic), xii and *passim*
- Eck, A., *author*, 82, 83
- Ecloga* (Ἐκλογὴ τῶν νόμων, *Ekloga*), *Byzantine legal handbook*, 79, 80, 85, 94–95
- Ecumenical Council, *Fifth-Sixth, Quinisextum, Trullanum*, 89
- ΕΝΗΘΕΛΑΚΤΕΥΣ, sole ruler*, 66, 101
- Egypt (ians), 58, 59, 64, 136
- attacks of*, 58
- kingship*, 64
- pharaohs of*, 35
- Elizabeth, *daughter of Jaroslav Vladimirovich*, 133
- Elon, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Elton, O., *author*, 139
- Embach (Emajõgi), *river*, 58
- England (-ish), 117
- Ἐπαναγωγὴ, Epanagoge, Byzantine law book*, 73
- Ephesos, 136
- Ephraim, cf. Israel
- Ephrem, *metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'*, 83
- ФФРЕМЪ КОРМЧАМ, The Ephrem Handbook*, 86
- Estonia, 58
- Europe (-ian), 23, 25, 51, 104, 124
- Central*, 42
- scribes*, 112
- Western*, 42, 83, 123
- Eve, *wife of biblical Adam*, 8
- EXUSIOCRATOR, *supreme authority*, 101
- Eymundar Saga*, 132

- Featherstone, M., *author*, 26
 Fedotov, G.P., *author*, 27, 54, 67, 123, 124, 156
 φιλανθρωπία, *philanthropy*, 85
 Filaret, *archbishop of Chernigov and author*, 27
 Fisher, R.T., Jr., *author*, 16
 Florinsky, M.T., *author*, 1250
 Fögen, Marie Theres, *author*, 85
 Fomin, V.V., *author*, 16, 127, 128
 Forbes, N., *author*, 68, 83
 Franks (-ish), 83, 114, 1317
 Franklin, S., *author*, 31, 35, 41, 51, 65, 67, 99
 Freshfield, E.H., *author*, 79
 Fritzler, K., *author*, 67, 83

 Gaber, *Hebrew governor*, 35
 Galaad, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
 Galicia, *province*, 32
 Eastern, 32
 Galkina, Elena S., *author*, 20
 Garcia de la Puente, I., *author*, 22
 Garda, cf. *Kievan Rus'*
 Gardariki, *land of fortified towns*, 128
 Gardizī, *Persian writer*, 139
 Gedeonov, S., *author*, 112
 George the Monk (Georgios Hamartolos), *Byzantine scribe*, 8
 Georgios Kedrenos, *Byzantine annalist*, 25
 German (-ic, s), xi and *passim*
 annals, 7, 49
 law, 117
 monk(s), 9, 11
 scribes, 132, 133
 text, 98
 Gezer, *Canaanite fortress*, 35
 Gideon, *Israelite judge*, 55, 56
 Gilead, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
 Gimbutas, Marija, *author*, 22, 150
 Gimon, T.V., *author*, 2, 3
 Ginnius, A.A., *author*, 2, 3
 Gleb Vladimirovich, *prince*, 33–34 and *passim*
 Goeje, M.J., *author*, 138
 Goetz, L.K., *author*, 82, 83
 Golb, N., *author*, 136, 142
 Golden, P.B., *author*, 138
 Golden Gate, *Kievan entry*, 61
 Golubinsky, E.E., *author*, 6, 13, 27, 34, 47, 49, 83
 Gordiyenko, D., *author*, 26
 Gorislava, cf. *Rogned*
 Gorlin, M., *author*, 128

 Gorsky, A.B., *author*, 65
 Gospels, 65–66
 Gostomysl', *ruler of Novgorod*, 128, 129
 градъ, градъ, *town(s)*, 12 and *passim*
 Granberg, J., *author*, 3, 149
 Great Moravian Empire, 94, 95, 96
 Greek(s), xi and *passim*
 colonial city, 34
 community, 11
 law(s), 77, 78, 96, 107
 literature, 148
 merchants, 11
 monks, 96
 nun, 52
 text(s), 10 and *passim*
 Gregory, *monk*, 11
 Grekov, B.D., *author*, 21, 23, 27, 34, 41, 116, 156, 161
 Gressmann, H., *author*, 64
 grivna, grivny, *Rus' monetary unit*, 95, 109
 Grousset, R., *author*, 135
 Gruzinsky, A.E., *author*, 3
 Gudzy, N.K., *author*, 3
 Guillard, R., *author*, 103
 Gumilev, L.N., *author*, 24, 28, 136
 Gurevich, A.N., *author*, 41

 Hakon, *Scandinavian king*, 113, 131
 Halperin, C.J., *author*, 5, 12, 81–82
 Halvdan (Halfdan) the Black, *king of Norway*, 117, 127
 Hammer, D.P., *author*, 116
 Hanak, W.K., *author*, 2, 9, 10, 11, 20, 28–29, 34, 48, 68, 94, 163
 Harald, *king of Norway*, 133
 Harkavy, A.E., *author*, 135
 Hasdai Ibn-Shaprūt, *Spanish Hebrew writer*, 138, 144
 Hase, C.B., *author*, 10
 Hebrew(s), 35 and *passim*
 acrostic, 29–30
 chieftains, 36
 deities, 46
 faith, 46, 164
 history, 42, 64, 66
 king(s), 31, 40, 42, 43, 54, 64, 66, 187
 kingdom, 35
 scribes, 167
 tradition, 50
 tribes, 7, 35, 69
 ἡγεμόνεα, *authority*, 91, 92
 Heimskringla, 142

- Hellmann, M., *author*, 133
- Hellenistic (-ism), 71, 73
Christian, 87
court style, 102
- Henry II, *Holy Roman Emperor*, 133
- Herod, *biblical king*, 64
- Hilarion, *presbyter and metropolitan*, 65, 66,
 83, 84, 93, 94, 136, 137, 145, 147–148, 169
- Hiram, *Phoenician king*, 44
- Hollander, L.M., *author*, 41, 108
- Hollingsworth, P., *author*, 47, 48, 54, 94
- Holy Roman Empire, 23
- Holy Trinity, 66
- Hrushevsky, M., *author*, 16, 113
- Hudud al-Alam, *Persian geographer*, 145, 147
- Hungarian princess, 9
- Hungary (-ian), 125, 151, 152
- Hussey, Jane M., *author*, 26, 91
- Ianin, V.L., *author*, 99–100, 101
- Ibn Khordādhbeh, *scribe*, 147
- Ibn-Hauqal, *Arab geographer*, 140
- Ibrahim al-Istakhri, *Arab traveler and geographer*, 140, 147
- Ibrahim ibn Jakub (Ben Yakub), *scribe*, 144
- Iconoclasm (-tic), *Byzantine religious movement*, 94
- Igor, *son of Riurik*, 17, 19, 129, 136–137, 147, 151
death of, 20
- Igor Jaroslavich, *prince*, 67, 123, 124
- Ikonnikov, V., *author*, 96
- Il'in, N.N., *author*, 54
- Il'men', *lake in northern Rus'*, 114
- Ilovaisky, D.I., *author*, 2
- imperator*, 49, 81, 101
- imperium*, 86, 91, 92, 96, 118
- India, 136
- Indo-European, 125
peoples, 107, 108, 156
- Ingelheim, *German city*, 112, 113
- Ingigerd, *wife of Jaroslav and daughter of the king of Sweden*, 69, 132
- Ioan, *metropolitan*, 43
- Ioannes VI Kantakouzenos, *Byzantine emperor and historian*, 103
- Ioannes Zonaras, *Byzantine annalist*, 103,
 104
- Ioannis Skylitzes, *Byzantine annalist*, 25, 33
- Ireland, 125
- Isaiah*, *OT*, 54, 55, 110, 120
- Īsha*, cf. *beg*
- Islam (Islamic), 23, 130
- Israel(ite[s]), 35, 42, 54, 56, 57, 59, 64, 130, 143
general, 59
king(s) of, 28, 66
judge, 55
monarchy, 56
tribal structure, 162
- Issachor, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Istrin, V.M., *author*, 3–4, 8
- Itil, *capital city of Khazaria*, 128
- Iur'ev, *town*, 58
- Iushkov, S.V., *author*, 2, 82, 83, 84, 116, 127
- Iustellius, H., *author*, 80
- Izjaslav Jaroslavich, *prince*, 67, 68, 124
- Izjaslav Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 38, 43,
 52
- Jakob [Jacob], *monk and scribe*, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14,
 22, 26, 34, 46, 75, 136
- Jan Dlugosz, *annalist*, 7
- janaka*, *Sanskrit petty ruler*, 112, 127
- Jaropolk Svjatoslavich, *prince*, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,
 13, 14, 122, 129, 152, 153, 175
assassination of, 13
wife of, 38, 52
- Jaropolk Vladimirovich, 36
- Jaroslav I Vladimirovich, *prince*, xii and
passim
khagan, 155
Testament of, 75
- Jatvjagi (Iatviangi, Iatvingians, *Lithuanian tribe*, 32, 60, 160
- Jehudah ha-Levi, *rabbinic writer and poet-physician*, 138
- Jenkins, R.J. H., *author*, 25, 77
- Jerimiah*, *OT*, 30
- Jeroboam, *Solomon's officer and king of Israel*, 57, 143
- Jerubbaal, *biblical figure*, 56
- Jerusalem, *biblical city*, 42, 57, 152
- Jewish (Jew[s]), cf. *Hebrew*
- Joachim, *bishop of Novgorod*, 128
ЮБИЛИКАМ ЛѢТОПИСЬ, *The Joachim Chronicle*, 14, and *passim*
- John the Divine, *apostle*, 136
- John Scholastikos, *patriarch of Constantinople*, 80, 82, 85, 86, 88
- John I Tzimiskes, *Byzantine emperor*, 98, 99
- Jones, G., *author*, 126
- Josaphat, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Joseph, *Hebrew tribe of*, 10
- Joseph, *Khazar king*, 138

- Judah, *Hebrew kingdom*, 56, 57, 59
- Judaism (-ic), 43, 130, 135, 137, 138, 144, 145
rabbinic law, 138, 144
- Judea, 66–74
- Judges, Book of, OT*, 62
- Justinian I, *Byzantine emperor*, 85, 86
Codex, 85
Corpus Juris Civilis, 85, 86, 87
Digesta, 85
Novellae, 85, 86, 87
- Justinian II, *Byzantine emperor*, 89
- Kaghan*, cf. *Khazar khagan*
- Kaldellis, A., *author*, 103
- οἱ κανόνες, *canons*, 80
- Восемнадцатый сборникъ XIV титуловъ, The Nomokanon of Fourteen Titles*, 88
- Karatay, O., *author*, 103
- Kartashev, A.V., *author*, 11
- Kasogi, *tribe*, 58, 130, 143
κατάρχων, subregulus, 104
казанская духовная академия № 616, 136
- Kazhdan, A.P., *author*, 35, 48, 91, 103
- Kedrenos, *Byzantine chronicler*, 102, 90, 93, 103, 104
- Keenan, E.L., *author*, 149
- Kendrick, T.D., *author*, 126
- Kern, F., *author*, 120, 125, 132
- khagan, chacanus, Khazar ruler*, 18, 113, 114, 137, 138, 139, 140, 144, 147
grand, great, 137, 138, 139
law, 163
- khan*, cf. *Khazar khagan*
- Khāqān*, cf. *Khazar khagan*
- Khazar(s), xi and *passim*
khagan(s, -ate), 18, 24, 113
135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 144, 148
Jewish, 24, 25, 74, 135, 144, 145
lands of, 9
religious standards, 145
Turkic, 135
- Khazaria, 159, 144, 146, 147
ἡ χλαμύς, *mantle*, 100
- Kherson (Korsun, Cherson), *Byzantine Crimean coastal city*, 34, 75, 76, 77
- Хронографъ редакциии 1512 года, The Chronograph Redaction of 1512*, 5 and *passim*
- Khors, *Kievan Rus' deity*, 22, 23
- Khrushchov, I.P., *author*, 3
- Kiev (-an), *appanage period*, 155
history, 9, 126
khaganate, 22
lands of, 11 and *passim*
seat, 12 and *passim*
state, 10 and *passim*
town, 1 and *passim*
- Kievan Rus', xi and *passim*
- Kleimola, Ann M., *author*, 77, 81–82, 94–95
- Klimov, E.V., *author*, 28
- Kliuchevsky, V.O., *author*, 67, 124, 125, 146, 163, 168
- Книга степенная царского родооловима, The Book of Ranks of Tsarist Genealogy*, 5 and *passim*
- кнѣзь, князь (pl. кнѣзи, князи)*, 1 and *passim*
- Koch, H., *author*, 27
- Kokovtsov, P.K., *author*, 86, 157, 163
- Kollmann, Nancy S., *author*, 67
- konigr, konungar, kœnungarðr, king*, 126 and *passim*
- Кормчимъ книга, The Pilot's Handbook*, 85, 89
- Koroliuk, V.D., *author*, 90, 154–155
- Korpela, J., *author*, 81
- Kotlar, N.F., *author*, 4
- Kovalevsky, A.P., *author*, 139
- Kovalevsky, M., *author*, 156
- Kowalski, T., *author*, 144
- Krachkovsky, I. Iu., *author*, 139
- Krallis, D., *author*, 103
- Krivichi, *tribe*, 12, 128, 155
- Kroll, W., *author*, 85
- Krueger, P., *author*, 85
- Krug, P., *author*, 144
- Krumbacher, K., *author*, 25, 91, 97, 103
- Kucherov, S., *author*, 116
- Kunik, E. *author*, 114
- **kuningaz*, cf. *konigr*
- Kurze, F., *author*, 25, 51
- Kuyābah*, cf. Kiev
- Kuz'min, A.G., *author*, 4, 20
- Laehr, G., *author*, 18, 26, 32, 146
- Laurent, V., *author*, 27
- Lavrov, P.A., *author*, 54
- Lebedev, V., *author*, 6
- Lenhoff, Gail D., *author*, 5, 77
- Leo III, *Byzantine emperor*, 94, 95
- Leon Diakonos, *Byzantine annalist*, 10, 34, 35, 75
- Leontos, *metropolitan*, 43
- Letiche, J.M., *author*, 116

- Лѣтопись по Воскресенскому списку*, *The Annal according to the Voskresensk Rendition*, 5 and *passim*
- Levchenko, M.V., *author*, 97, 100
- Lewicki, T., *author*, 135
- Likhachev, D.S., *author*, 3, 4, 6, 24, 32, 66
- Likhachev, N.P., *author*, 101
- Linnichenko, I.A., *author*, 161
- Lipshits, Elena E., *author*, 79, 112
- Litavrin, G.G., *author*, 20, 25, 26, 90, 91, 151
- Lithuania (-ns), 60, 61
- Ljakhs (Liakhs), *tribe*, 16, 32, 111
- Ljubech, *town*, 17
- Ljut, *son of Sveinald*, 12
- ὁ λόγος, *verbal noun*, 79
- ὁ λόγος, *thong*, 100
- Louis II, *German king*, 112, 113, 114
- Lowmiański, H., *author*, 113, 127
- Lunt, H.G., *author*, 4
- Львовская Лѣтопись*, *The L'vov Annal*, 5 and *passim*
- Macartney, C.A., *author*, 151
- Macbeth, *Scottish claimant to the throne*, 125
- McCormick, M., *author*, 48, 72
- Macces, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Macûrek, J., *author*, 4
- Mageddo, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Magyar(s), *cf. Hungarian*
- Makarii, *metropolitan and author*, 6, 7, 27, 47, 49, 75, 82, 136
- Malcolm III, *son of Duncan*, 125
- Mal'fred, *purported wife of Vladimir*, 38, 40
- Malusha, *stewardess of Olga and mother of Vladimir*, 52
- Manaim, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- manbot*, *compensation for injury*, 117
- Mango, C.A., *author*, 19
- Maniscalco-Basile, G., *author*, 8
- Margaret, *Scottish saint*, 125
- Maria Monomachos, *Byzantine princess and wife of Vsevolod Jaroslavich*, 93, 94, 99–100
- Maria, *purported daughter of Vladimir and Anna*, 37
- Mark, *apostle*, 136
- Marquart, J., *author*, 135
- Martin, R.E., *author*, 22, 162
- Marvazî, *Persian writer*, 139
- Masâlik ul-Mamâlik, Travels and Kingdoms*, 140
- Mas'ûdî, *author*, 140
- Mazovi, *Polish people*, 61
- Mediterranean Sea, *eastern*, 42
- Mel'nikova, Elena A., *author*, 10, 25, 92
- Mer, *Finnish tribe*, 128
- Merseberg, *episcopal seat*, 51, 133
- Methodios, *saint*, 94
- Meyendorff, J., *author*, 27
- Michael, *metropolitan*, 36
- Michael Attaleiates, *Byzantine chronicler*, 91–92
- Michael Psellos, *Byzantine annalist*, 34, 91, 92, 93, 103
- Michell, R., *author*, 68
- Midianites, *northern Arabian biblical people*, 56
- Migne, J., *author*, 11
- Mikado, 138
- Millard, M., *author*, 38
- Miller, G.F., *author*, 2
- Miller, T.S., *author*, 9
- Milov, L.V., *author*, 80
- Minorsky, V., *author*, 24, 137, 139, 145
- "Mirror of Princes," *literary genre*, 137
- Mitrovits, T., *author*, 80
- Mohammad Ibn-Rusta, *Arab geographer*, 138, 139, 145, 147
- Mokosh, *Kievan Rus' deity*, 22, 23
- ὁ μοναρχος, *monarch*, 101
- Monastery of the Caves, *cf.*, *Monastery of the Crypts*
- Monastery of the Crypts, *Печерская лавра, Kiev*, 65
- Mongol, *khan*, 136
- Monsen, E., *author*, 41, 108, 110
- Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 61
- Moravcsik, Gy., *author*, 25, 77, 91, 97, 103, 151
- Moses, *biblical figure*, 65, 66
- Mosin, V.A., *author*, 126–127
- Московский Лѣтописный Сборъ XV Века*, *The Muscovite Annalistic Code of the Fifteenth Century*, 5 and *passim*
- Mount Ephraim, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Mstislav Vladimirovich, *prince*, 1 and *passim*
- Müller, L., *author*, 3, 54
- Muhammad ibn-'Ali al-Kâtib al-Samarqandi, *writer*, 137
- Murom, *town*, 16, 36, 40
- Mur'uj udh-Dhahab wa Ma'âdin ul-Jawâhir*, *Meadows of Gold and Mines of Precious Stones*, 140

- Muscovy (Moscow, Muscovite), 93, 129
historiography, 77
political ideology, 5, 17
Muscovite Rus', 73, 77
Third Rome, 77
- Musin, A.E., *author*, 68
- Мусин-Пушкинский Сборникъ 1414 года, *The Musin-Pushkin Collection of 1414*, 6 and *passim*
- Muslim(s), 24, 25, 74
- Nasonov, A.N., *author*, 5, 14, 99, 102, 119, 123, 124, 153
- Nazarenko, A.V., *author*, 7, 8, 9–10, 26, 38, 39, 41, 53, 90, 116
- Near Eastern, *passim*
sources, 137, 147
thought, 64
- Nephath-Dor, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Nephtali, *Hebrew governmental area*, 40
- Nesbitt, J., *author*, 9
- Nestor, *Rus' annalist*, 2
- New Testament, *biblical text*, 74, 107
- Nicol, D.M., *author*, 26
- Nikephoros Gregoras, *Byzantine historian*, 103
- Nikol'sky, N.K., *author*, 2, 4, 7, 47, 65, 82, 83
- Nikon, *patriarch of Moscow*, 79, 80, 85
Никонская Лѣтопись, *The Nikon Annal*, 5 and *passim*
- Νομοκάνων, *Nomokanon, Byzantine laws*, 80, 81–82, 83, 84, 55, 86, 88, 89, 98, 169
- ὁ νόμος, *law*, 79, 80
- Nordic, xi and *passim*
deities, 120
kingship, 121, 126
tribes, 108
- Normanist, 126
- Norse, *passim*
customs, 126
high king, 127
pagan deities, 142
royal houses, 129
scribes, 133
- Norway, 28, 133
king of, 117
- Novgorod (-ians), *annals*, 5, 161
assembly, 163, 169
lands, town and people, 9–10 and *passim*
prince of, 69, 115, 142, 161;
troops, 44
- Новгородская Карамзинская Лѣтопись*, *The Novgorodian Karamtzin Annal*, 7 and *passim*
- Новгородская Лѣтопись*, *The Novgorod Annal*, *four redactions*, 15 and *passim*
- Новгородская Лѣтопись по Синодальному Харатейному списку*, 115, 160, 161
- Новгородская харатейная лето-пись*, *The Characteristic Novgorod Annal*, 7 and *passim*
- Novosel'tsev, A.P., *author*, 25, 27, 28, 116, 123, 151
- Nowak, F., *author*, 150, 154, 157
- Obolensky, D., *author*, 24, 26, 72, 73, 87, 97, 103–104, 113
odel (alod), land right, 127
- Oesterley, W.O. E., *author*, 64, 65
- Oikonomides, N., *author*, 9
- Oikoumene, Christian world*, 103, 104
- Olaf, *king of Sweden*, 132
- Olaf Saga*, 131, 132
- Olaf Tryggvason, *king of Norway*, 28, 131, 142
saga of, 131, 132, 142
- Old Testament, *biblical text*, 7 and *passim*
tribal tradition, 22
- Oleg, *kin of Riurik*, 17, 18, 19, 96, 121, 147, 150
- Oleg Svjatoslavich, *prince*, 9, 12, 122, 129
- Olesch, R., *author*, 49
- Olga, *princess*, 1 and *passim*
- Olova, *mother of Vysheslav Vladimirovich*, 38
- Omri, *Israelite general*, 59
- Orthodox (-y), 11
faith, 47, 120, 136
- Örvarodda Saga*, 128
- Oster, *river*, 44
- Ostrogorsky, G., *author*, 72, 75, 99
- Ostrowski, D.G., *author*, 4, 28, 162
- Otto I, *Holy Roman Emperor*, 26, 99
- Otto II, *Holy Roman Emperor*, 98, 99
- Ovruch, *town*, 40
- Память и похвала равноапостольному князю Владимиру*, *A Eulogy and Praise of the Apostle—like Prince Vladimir*, 6 and *passim*
- Panov, V., *author*, 4
- Papadakis, A., *author*, 89
- Parkhomenko, V.A., *author*, 18, 27, 42, 135, 143, 150

- Pashuto, V.T., *author*, 51, 66, 129
- Paszkievicz, H., *author*, 9, 27, 41, 127, 161, 168
- Patmos, 136
- ПАТРИАРХАЛ ИЛИ НИКОНОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ**,
The Patriarchal or Nikon Annal, 5 and
passim
- Paul, *Byzantine bishop*, 28
- Paul, *saint*, 136
- Pecheneg(s), *Asiatic nomadic steppe tribe*, xi
and *passim*
- peg, *peh*, cf. *beg*
- Perejaslavets, *Danubian town*, 9
- Perejaslavl', *town*, 67, 124
- Peremyszl', *town*, 15, 16, 32
- Perrie, Maureen, *author*, 17
- Persian, 136, 144–145
text, 137
- Persowski, F., *author*, 59
- Pertz, G.H., *author*, 112
- Perun, *Kievan Rus' deity*, 22, 23
- Peter, *saint*, 136
- Petrov, N.I., *author*, 100, 101
- Petrukhina, V. Ia., *author*, 136
- Philipp, W., *author*, 145
- Philistines, *biblical people*, 57, 58, 130
- Phoenician, 44
- Photios, *patriarch of Constantinople*, 19
- Pitra, J.B., *author*, 80
- Plokhly, S., *author*, 149
- Podskalsky, G., *author*, 11, 82
- Pogodin, M., *author*, 2, 126
- ПОУЧАЛА КАГАНУ ВЛАДИМИРУ**, *A Eulogy to the
Khagan Vladimir*, 46, 65, 66, 85, 136, 146,
147
- ПОУЧАЛА КНЯГИНИЪ ѠЛГИ...**, 11, 26
- ПОУЧАЛА СТРАГОТРЪПЦЕМЪ БОРИСУ И ГЛѢБУ**,
A Praise for the Martyrs Boris and Gleb,
54
- Pokrovsky, N.N., *author*, 5
- Pokrovsky, S., *author*, 116
- Poland, 33, 59, 125, 140
king of, 53, 61
- Poles (Polish), xi and *passim*
- Poljane, *Eastern Slavic tribe*, 20, 141
- Polotsk, *town*, 16, 38, 68
- Ponomarev, A.T., *author*, 6, 65, 66, 136, 137
- Porpe, A., *author*, 1, 11, 26, 27–28, 34, 35, 37,
38–39, 67, 89–90, 92, 168
- ПОСАДЬНИКИ**, *governors*, 36, 60, 127, 142
- Potles, M., *author*, 80
- Poulik, J., *author*, 94
- ПОВѢСТЬ ВРЕМЕННЫХЪ ЛѢТЪ**, *The Tale of
Bygone Years, The Russian Primary
Chronicle, Laurentian and Hypatian
redactions*, xiii and *passim*
- Pozvzd Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 40
- Predslava, *wife of Jaropolk Svjatoslavich*, 38
- Preobrazhensky, A.G., *author*, 111, 112
- Presniakov, A.E., *author*, 3, 9, 18, 21, 23, 27, 41,
67, 83, 116, 124, 156, 160
- Prinzing, G., *author*, 39
- Pripet marshes, 61
- Priselkov, M.D., *author*, 3, 4, 5, 10, 34, 92, 94,
99, 102, 109, 111, 119, 123, 124, 146, 153
- Pritsak, O., *author*, 3, 8, 23, 136, 142
- Procházka, Vl., *author*, 94, 95
- ΠΡΟΧΕΙΡΟΣ ΝΟΜΟΣ**, *The Common Law*, 95
- Proverbs, Book of*, OT, 29, 63, 64, 163
- Prudentius, *bishop of Tyres*, 112, 113
- Psalter, Book of Psalms*, 152, 162
- Pskov, *town*, 40, 60, 68
- ПСКОВСКАЯ ЛѢТОПИСЬ**, *The Pskov Annal*, three
redactions, 5 and *passim*
- Pushkarev, S.G., *author*, 16
- qaġan*, cf. *khagan*
- Radimichi, *Eastern Slavic tribe*, 18, 21, 32
- Raffensperger, C., *author*, 11, 28, 37, 101, 104
- Rafn, C.C., *author*, 128, 131, 132
- rājān*, cf. *Khazar khagan*
- Ramoth, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Rankin, O.S., *author*, 65
- РАЗБОЙНИЦИ**, *bandits*, 50, 130, 131
- Red cities, 32, 42, 59, 61
- Rededia, *chieftain of Kasogi*, 58
- Regel, W., *author*, 100
- Rehoboam, *son of Solomon*, 57, 58, 59
- Reiske, J.J., *author*, 11, 83
- Renauld, E., *author*, 34, 91, 103
- rex, reges*, 112, 113, 114, 133
- Rhalles, G.A., *author*, 80
- Riasanovsky, A.V., *author*, 113, 127
- Riurik, *prince?*, 17, 19, 116, 117, 126, 128
- Riurikid(s), *authority of*, 16, 18, 21, 107, 152,
144, 155
house of, 16 and *passim*
princes, 150, 156, 162
- РОДЪ**, *kin*, 156, 157, 159, 161
- Rodnja, *town*, 16
fortifications of, 13
- Rog'ned, *wife of Vladimir I*, 37, 38, 41, 142
- Roman (Romanos), *Christian name of Boris
Vladimirovich*, 37

- Roman(s), 163
administration, 104
caesar, 148
law(s), 79
rites, 23
ruler(s), 8, 71–72
- Roman empire, 115
- Romanos I Lekapenos, *Byzantine emperor*, 86
- Romanos II, *Byzantine emperor*, 33, 37
- Romanov, B.A., *author*, 3, 31, 116
- Rome, 49, 56, 114, 117
- Róna-Tas, A., *author*, 138
- Ros', *river*, 13, 58
- Rostov, *town*, 16, 36, 37, 38, 39, 68
- rota*, *system of succession*, 125
- Rothe, H., *author*, 49
- Rozvold, *father of Rog'ned*, 38
- Rubinshtein, N.L., *author*, 4
- Rus', *passim*
annalists, *passim*
history, 1, 134
iconography, 50
lands, 12, 117
literary apologists, 71
sources, 71
- Russian, 35
historians, 26
- Русская Правда*, *The Rus' Law*, 95, 116, 117–118, 119, 132, 159–160
- Rybakov, B.A., *author*, 135
- Rydzevskaia, Elena A., *author*, 41, 129
- sacerdotium*, 86, 92, 118
- Saint George, *monastery of*, Kiev, 62
- Saint Irene, *convent of*, Kiev, 62
- Saint Sophia (Holy Wisdom), *church of*, Kiev, 62, 84, 92, 146
- Saint Sophia, *church of*, Novgorod, 62
- sak-tal*, *Nordic code*, 116, 117
- Salamon, M., *author*, 39
- Salebin, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Salic Law*, *Frankish code*, 117
- самодержецъ*, *autocrat*, 50
- самовластѣць*, *autocrat or sole ruler*, 59, 101
- Samuel*, OT, 30, 152
- Sanskrit, 112, 127, 136
- Sassanid, *kings*, 137
- Saturník, T., *author*, 85, 95
- Saxo Grammaticus, *Danish historian-poet*, 139, 140
- Сборникъ въ память святого равноап-*
остоляного князѣ Владимира, *The*
Collection of the Saintly Apostolic Co-
equal Prince Vladimir, 6–7 and *passim*
- Scandinavia (-ian), xi and *passim*
annal(s), 7
deities, 25
mercenaries, 35
nobles, 28
political thought, 108, 125
royal houses, 41, 126
saga(s), 27, 129
trade, 42
- Schechter, S., *author*, 86, 138, 140, 144
- Scherer, J.B., *author*, 2
- Schlözer, A.L., *author*, 2
- Schlyter, J., *author*, 114
- Schmeidler, B., *author*, 90
- Schminck, A., *author*, 73, 80
- Schoell, R., *author*, 96
- Schopen, L., *author*, 103
- Scotland, 125
- Semei, *Hebrew governor*, 35
- Semenovker, B.A., *author*, 82
- Senkovsky, B., *author*, 126
- Sepher ha-Kūzarī*, *The Book of Khazars*, 138
- Sephton, J., *author and trans.*, 28, 131
- Serbia(-n), 125
annalistics, 2
- Serbina, K.N., *author*, 40
- Serebriansky, N., *author*, 47, 54
- Sergeevich, V.I., *author*, 116, 154, 159, 161, 163
- Sever, *Eastern Slavic tribe*, 18, 141
- Sewter, E.R. A., *author*, 34, 91
- Shaikin, A.A., *author*, 19, 22, 29, 39, 45, 48, 49, 52, 53, 63, 67, 99, 90, 142
- Shakhmatov, A.A., *author*, 3, 4, 6, 7, 27, 54
- Sharaf al-Zamān Tāhīr Marvazī*..., 157
- Shchapov, Ia. N., *author*, 43, 62, 82, 83, 84, 85
- Shekera, I.M., *author*, 57, 90
- Shelamanov, N.B., *author*, 3
- Shepard, J., *author*, 17, 35, 39, 50, 51, 90, 92, 96, 99, 113–114, 149
- Sherbowitz-Wetzor, O.P., *author*, 3, 44, 59
- Sherman, I.L., *author*, 4
- Ševčenko, I., *author*, 8, 20, 97, 98
- Shostak, M.V., *author*, 16
- Shusharin, V.P., *author*, 2, 145, 146, 155
- Silk, E., *author*, 27
- Simar'gl, *Kievan Rus' deity*, 22, 23
- sīmurgh*, 138
- Siuziumov, M. Ia., *author*, 79

- Сказання о святыхъ Борисѣ и Глебѣ**, *The Legend of Boris and Gleb*, 54
- Skorupsky, Marta, *trans.*, 16
- Slav(s), 9 and *passim*
- Slavic, Slavonic, *passim*
- annals*, 58
- code*, 21
- customary laws*, 21 and *passim*
- deities*, 22, 135
- elders*, 27
- lands*, 24 and *passim*
- nobles*, 30
- pagans*, 22 and *passim*
- scribe(s)*, 8 and *passim*
- text(s)*, 8 and *passim*
- tribes*, 9 and *passim*
- troops*, 88
- Slovenes, *Eastern Slavic tribe*, 12, 155
- Слово о законѣ Моисеемъ, даннемъ. и о благодати и истинѣ, Исусъ Христомъ въшшииъ**, *A Discourse on the Laws, Given Through Moses, and Of the Grace and the Truth Brought by Jesus Christ*, 65, 66
- Smith, A.H., *trans.*, 41
- Smolensk, *town*, 17, 40, 65, 124
- Snorre Sturluson, *historian*, 41 and *passim*
- Софійская Лѣтопись**, *The Sofia Annal*, two redactions, 5 and *passim*
- Solomon, *Hebrew king*, 7 and *passim*
- Solov'ev, A.V., *author*, 101, 112
- Soloviev, S.M., *author*, 11, 20, 31, 34, 44, 67, 112, 125, 143
- Sotnikova, Marina P., *author*, 101
- Spain, 138
- Spassky, I.G., *author*, 101
- Spock, Jennifer B., *author*, 22, 162
- Spulber, C.A., *author*, 79
- Sreznevsky, I.I., *author*, 54, 86
- Sreznevsky, V.I., *author*, 6, 10, 11, 26, 65, 136
- Stanislav Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 40
- староста*, *elder*, 156, 157, 159
- старци градские*, *town-elders*, 24, 30
- Stender-Petersen, A., *author*, 21
- Stephen, *king of Hungary*, 33
- Stephenson, P., *author*, 39
- Stökl, G., *author*, 29
- Stratonov, I., *author*, 116
- Stribog, *Kievan Rus' deity*, 22
- Strykovsky Chronicle*, 68
- Stubbs, W., *author*, 117
- Stugna, *river*, 44
- Sudislav Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 40, 60
- Sula, *river*, 44
- Sullivan, D.F., *author*, 34
- Suvorov, N.N., *author*, 95
- Sveinald, *military commander of Svjatoslav*, 10, 11, 12, 13
- Svjatopolk Vladimirovich(?), *prince*, 1 and *passim*
- Svjatoslav Igorevich, *prince*, 7 and *passim*
- Svjatoslav Jaroslavich, *prince*, 67, 68, 124, 146
- Svjatoslav Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 40
- Sweden, *king of*, 69, 132, 133
- Swedish, 113
- Sylvester, *Rus' annalist*, 2
- Symeon Logothetes and Meta-phrastes, *Byzantine annalist*, 10
- Szefel, M., *author*, 82, 83
- Tabov, Io., *author*, 38
- Talbot, Alice-Mary, *author*, 34, 103
- tanistry*, *Germanic system of succession*, 125
- Tatishchev, V.N., *author*, 3, 14, 24, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 52, 68, 93, 128, 129, 143, 151
- Temple, *biblical*, 43, 47
- Teutonic, *scribes*, 11–112
- Thanac, *Hebrew governmental area*, 35
- Theopemptos, *metropolitan of Kiev*, 92
- Theophana, *daughter of Vladimir and Anna*, 37
- Theophano, *Byzantine princess and wife of Otto II*, 99
- Theophilos, *Byzantine emperor*, 112, 113
- Thietmar, *bishop of Merseberg*, 51, 133
- Thing*, *Norse assembly*, 114, 156
- Thomas, *apostle*, 136
- Thorwald Kodranson, *member of Byzantine Varangian guard*, 131
- Thurn, I., *author*, 25
- Tikhomirov, M.N., *author*, 4, 5, 7, 18, 82, 83, 90, 94, 95, 116, 142
- Tmutorokan', *town*, 38, 57, 68
- church of Holy Virgin*, 58
- Tolochko, P.P., *author*, 3, 9, 154
- Tolstoi, I.I., *author*, 100
- Toparcha Gothicus*, 97–98, 99
- Tortika, A.A., *author*, 142
- Троицкая Лѣтопись**, *The Trinity Annal*, 5 and *passim*
- Trapp, E., *author*, 37
- Tret'iakov, P.N., *author*, 150
- Trier, *bishopric*, 25
- Trotsky, I.M., *author*, 31
- Trubezh, *river*, 44

- Trullo, *city*, 89
 Tryes, *city*, 112
 tsar, 49, 50, 133
 царица, *empress*, 109
 Tschan, F.J., *author*, 90, 133
 Tsvetkov, S.V., *author*, 20
 Tsyb, S.V., *author*, 26
 Turkic, 137, 145
 law, 144
 nation, people, 10, 151
 Turov, *town*, 36, 37, 38
 Тверская Лѣтопись, *The Tver Annal*, 5 and *passim*
- Udalrich (Oldřich), *prince of Bohemia*, 33
 Uspensky, B.A., *author*, 54
 Устава святаго князя Владимира, *The Statute of Prince Vladimir*, 43, 62, 81, 82, 33, 84, 98, 118, 169
 Устава великаго князя Ярослава, *The Statute of the Grand Prince Jaroslav*, 62, 83, 84, 98, 117, 169
 Устюжский летописный свод, *cf. Serbina*
- Vaillant, A., *author*, 3
 Val'denberg, V., *author*, 73, 87, 146
 Vandals, *Germanic tribe*, 125
 kingdoms, 125
 Varangian Rus', 166–167
 domain, 17
 Varangian-Slavic, 78, 80
 deities, 7, 23, 74
 elites, 13
 pagan(s), 9, 23, 74, 78
 practices, 46
 society, 86
 Varangian-Slavic Rus', 9, 22
 elite, 13
 populace, 13
 Varangians (Northmen, Vikings), xi and *passim*
 boyars, 18
 clans, 16
 code, 21
 customary laws, 21 and *passim*
 elders, 27
 ethnicity, 9
 guard, 13, 131
 mercenaries, 12, 29, 39, 115
 nobles, 30
 pagans, 12
 princes, 18
 renegade(s), 19
 retainers, 132
 troops, 44, 88
 Vašica, J., *author*, 94
 Vasilev'sky, V.G., *author*, 35, 85, 97
 Vasiliev, A.A., *author*, 19, 35, 74, 75, 85, 135, 136
 Vasmer, M., *author*, 111
 ВѢЛКИИ КНЯЗЬ/КНЯЗЬ, *grand prince*, 1, 98, 127
 Vernadsky, G., *author*, 16, 27, 67, 82, 83, 85, 112, 116, 117, 124, 145, 146, 151, 152, 160, 161
 Ves', *Baltic tribe*, 128
 vice-khagan, *vice-king*, 138
 Vilkul, Tat'iana L., *author*, 149
 Vistula, *river*, 36
 basin, 32
 Vjacheslav Jaroslavich, *prince*, 67, 124
 Vjatichi, *Eastern Slavic tribe*, 15, 16, 21, 32, 141, 155
 вѣче, *town council*, 18 and *passim*
 Vladimir (Volodomir), *town*, 36, 38, 67, 123, 124
 Vladimir Jaroslavich, *prince*, 90
 Vladimir Monomach, *prince*, 99
 Vladimir I Svjatoslavich, *prince*, xi and *passim*, *khagan*, 136–137
 great khagan, 136–137
 Владимирский Лѣтописецъ, *The Vladimir Annalist*, 6 and *passim*
 ВЛАДЫЧЕСТВО (sovereignty), 50
 Vlasto, A.P., *author*, 27, 83–84, 94
 Vodolazkin, E.G., *author*, 3
 Voellius, G., *author*, 80
 ВОЕВОДА (sg.pl. -и), ὁ βοεβόδος, *military commander(s)*, 147 and *passim*
 Vogt, A., *author*, 11, 25, 83
 Volga, *river*, 136, 151
 upper, 32
 region, 32
 Von Lilienfeld, F., *author*, 48–49
 Von Muralt, E., *author*, 8
 Vrychyi, *town*, 12
 Vsevolod Jaroslavich, *prince*, 67, 68, 93, 99, 124
 Vsevolod Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 38
 Vysheslav Vladimirovich, *prince*, 36, 37, 38, 51
 Vysotsky, S.A., *author*, 146
- Wahlgren, S., *author*, 10
 Waitz, G., *author*, 112
 Watson, A., *author*, 85

- wer, wergeld, worth of man's life*, 116, 117, 119, 159, 168
Wessex Law, 117
 Westberg, F., *author*, 97, 98
 Wisdom Movement, 63, 64, 66
 Wortley, J., *author*, 25

 Yahweh, 46, 47, 59
Ynglinga Saga, 108, 111, 120, 126, 127

 Zachariae von Lingenthal, K.E., *author*, 73, 79, 85, 95
ЗАКОНЪ, τὸ ζᾶκωνον, law or faith, 79, 144, 151
ЗАКОНЪ СУДНЫХЪ ЛЮДЕМЪ, The Juridical Law for Laymen, 94–95

ЗАВЕЩАННѢ, Testament of Jaroslav, 67, 68, 123, 124, 125
Zayn al-Akhbar, written work of Gadizī, 139
 Zenkovsky, Betty A., *author*, 5
 Zenkovsky, S.A., *author*, 5, 11, 22, 36, 48, 56, 94, 99, 102, 109, 111, 119, 123, 124, 153
 Zepos, J., *author*, 73, 95
 Zepos, P., *author*, 73, 95
 Zernack, K., *author*, 155, 157
 Zernov, N., *author*, 23, 83, 160, 161
 Žužek, P.I., *author*, 80
 Zimin, A.A., *author*, 46, 47, 82
ЖИТИЕ БЛАЖЕНАГО ВОЛОДИМИРА, The Life of the Blessed Vladimir, 46–47, 48, 49, 136
 Zuckerman, C., *author*, 26

